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CHAPTER I

THE FIELD AND BACKGROUND OF THE PROBLEM

Introduction

Statement of the problem.—Briefly stated the problem of this thesis is to determine the implications of certain aspects of homogeneous grouping for democracy. Implicit in this statement of the problem is an examination of those aspects of homogeneous grouping in the school and their relationship to the American conception of democracy. Also implied in the statement of the problem is an investigation of the complex set of factors which together make up and influence democracy—particularly democracy in the United States.

Scope of the study.—The problem is limited to an investigation of homogeneous grouping, as defined herein, as practiced in the one school from which all of the data were gathered. No effort will be made to establish the validity or invalidity of homogeneous grouping in general from the psychological nor from the philosophical standpoint. An attempt will be made to investigate democracy and its status in the world milieu, with especial reference to the anti-democratic forces in both the Old World and the New, for the purpose of determining, tentatively, a program for democracy in the light of the contemporary scene. An analysis of the relationship education bears to democracy, not only in the present, but in the past and in the future, as well, will also be attempted. The character of the data, as well as the techniques applied in securing them,
precludes any attempt at establishing a valid cause-effect relationship between the particular type of homogeneous grouping practiced in the school and the conditions revealed by the investigatory program. The data are, however, of sufficient significance to permit the drawing of at least tentative conclusions regarding the problem as stated.

Purpose of the Study

The writer has been a teacher of science in The Stonewall Jackson Junior High School in Houston, Texas, for the past three years. During this time he has questioned in his mind many of the procedures and practices of the institution. Daily contact with a large part of the seventeen hundred children enrolled has given him the opportunity to observe at first hand many of the apparent maladjustments fairly common in the school. Observing these conditions caused the writer to believe that a field existed in which investigation was needed. The instrumentality, homogeneous grouping, with which the writer had not been previously familiar, attracted his attention particularly; however, for a period of nearly two years no technique adapted to an investigation of this situation presented itself. Finally, during the summer of 1939, the scheme presented in this thesis was evolved. The theory was that data, relating to attitudes, intelligence, and socio-economic status, taken from certain selected groups of students in the school, would arrange themselves statistically in such a way as to indicate with some degree of precision whether or not homogeneous grouping afforded a desirable framework within which democracy could be reasonably expected to operate, and thus be promoted.
Description of the Situation

Stonewall Jackson Junior High School was constructed in 1927, and since that time several additions have been made to the building. It is located in what is commonly called "the East End," a section largely populated by strictly "middle-class" Americans, with a fairly large sprinkling of American citizens of Mexican lineage. The district served by the school includes a fairly substantial modern residential section populated by native-born whites of the middle-income classification; an older residential section, populated at present largely by members of the lower income brackets; and a rather large residential section serving as the home of workers in a large variety of industries including the Hughes Tool Company, the Grand Prize Beer Company, The American Can Company, as well as a large number of smaller organizations including steel fabricators, furniture factories and warehouses, wholesale grocery concerns, and food manufacturers. In fact, the school serves, to a large extent, the workers employed in industrial Houston, though the ship channel and the industries located along it are not in the Jackson district. The "aristocracy" of Houston does not live in the Jackson district, and for that reason the data may not be quite so striking as would data taken from a school serving both the ultra-high income groups and the ultra-low income groups.

At the time that the study was made Houston had an eleven-grade system, though a twelve-grade system will be introduced during the coming year. Five grades compose the elementary school in the old eleven grade organization, with the other six grades divided evenly between the junior and senior high schools. Thus, Jackson was composed of the sixth, seventh,
and eighth grades, each of which was divided into a high and low half-grade. Each half-grade is also divided into sections, grouped homogeneously with regard to intelligence quotient and achievement score compiled from an average of all grades, with the exception of physical education grades and grades in broadening and finding courses. To a small degree teachers' judgments also enter into the grouping. The sections are regrouped at the close of both the fall and spring semesters, ostensibly for the purpose of achieving more complete homogeneity. In this regrouping, average academic achievement is by all odds the most important factor. In those half grades composed of children entering junior high school from the elementary schools in the fall there are ordinarily nine or ten sections, while in those half-grades composed of children entering the school at mid-term there are usually six sections. Ordinarily between thirty and thirty-six children are assigned to a section. The sections are designated by letters, such as low sixth "I" and high eighth "K," and these letters are rotated each year, so that the various sections in rank will have different designations each year. The letters designating the sections in order from highest rank to the lowest bear no relationship with the alphabetical arrangement of the letters.

The school is completely departmentalized and has the full quota of traditional subjects. The school day is divided into six class periods, each fifty to fifty-five minutes in length, and an "activity" period in the middle of the morning of thirty minutes. Because of the large enrollment of the school, which varies from approximately fifteen hundred and fifty to more than eighteen hundred, there are three twenty-five minute lunch periods, staggered into the class periods, so that during the two
hours and ten minutes between 10:55 A. M. and 1:05 P. M. each child has two class periods as well as his lunch period.

There is no student government in the school, but during their final semester the high eighth graders organize their class and elect a sponsor from among the members of the faculty who serve as registrars for the various sections affected. Commonly on two days of the week all the students remain in their home rooms at activity period, and the majority of these home rooms are organized in a more or less democratic fashion.

Approximately fifty-eight teachers make up the instructional staff, while there are both a principal and an assistant principal, the latter being largely in charge of the handling of those discipline problems insoluble by the classroom teacher in charge. The faculty of the school is weighted in favor of the women, there being only thirteen men, inclusive of the two administrators.

Definition of Terms

Democracy.--This term, an everyday part of speech for millions of Americans, is perhaps one of the most inexactively defined words in the vocabulary of the masses of the people. For the purposes of this thesis, democracy can probably best be defined in the terms of the assumptions upon which democracy rests. These are:

1. The essential dignity of man, the importance of protecting and cultivating his personality on a fraternal rather than a differential principle, and the elimination of special privileges based upon unwarranted or exaggerated emphasis on the human differentials.

2. Confidence in a constant drive toward the perfectibility of mankind.

3. The assumption that the gains of the commonwealths are essentially mass gains and should be diffused as promptly as possible
throughout the community without too great delay or too wide a
spread in differentials.

4. The desirability of popular decision in the last analysis on
basic questions of social direction and policy, and of recognized
procedures for the expression of such decisions and their validation
in policy.

5. Confidence in the possibility of conscious social change
accomplished through the process of consent rather than by the
methods of violence.1

Furthermore, as the term "democracy" is used in this thesis it
"implies that the social organization aims to widen continually the area
of common interests shared by all the members of the group."2 In general,
when the single word "democracy" is used herein it implies, as well, the
word "American," though this is not invariably the case.

Aristocracy.--The term "aristocracy" has been used with considerable
looseness in the thesis, and confusion may result from its semi-interchange-
ability with despotism, the Few, and autocracy. Perhaps the best defini-
tion of the word as used herein is in the terms of objections to it.

The curse of aristocracy is not that great men fill great places,
but that small men fill great places and piece out their inferiority
with arrogance. Truly great natures are likely to find a response
in the mass of mankind. They need not fear the Many as much as the
jealous Few. In the very nature of aristocracy it is difficult, if
not impossible, to appraise the position of the aristoi properly, to
be as expert and responsive to the problems of equitable distribution
as of production. Aristocracy tends to identify the public good with
its own material and spiritual values. Can aristocrats know what
justice is when they are judges in their own cause?3

Despotism.--In general the term refers to the so-called dictatorships
of Europe, Germany, Italy, and Russia, though in some cases the word may
stand for the form of economic and social inequality prevalent in America.

1Charles E. Merriam, The Democracy and the New Despotism, p. 11.
2William Bruce, Principles of Democratic Education, p. 270
3Merriam, op. cit., p. 91.
America. — "America" means more than the continent, and more than the geographical United States. The term is used in the sense of the people who inhabit our nation, and has the connotation of the ideals and principles of democracy peculiar to the United States.

Education. — This term, as used herein, refers not simply to the system which diffuses knowledge, including the buildings and personnel of the schools, but more especially to the philosophy which underlies the entire program and institution as we know it in America. A summary of the Dewey philosophy would probably come nearer representing the meaning accorded the word in this thesis.

a. Education is life. It is more than a preparation for life; it is a continuous process from the beginning to the end of life, both in and out of school.

b. Education is growth. When a child grows from what he is one day into what he is the next day, the great process of education is taking place. As long as growth continues, education is going on. Growth that begins in school and continues throughout life is the great goal of modern education.

c. Education is a continuous reconstruction of experience. The activities of each day are based on past experience. Every day of a child's life is conditioned upon previous days. However, if education is growth, some new element is added. When the new experience is added to the old, it is all recognized in the light of new experiences. This forms a new basis for experiences to come later.

d. Education is a social process. Education in America must be education for a democracy. If education is life and growth, then it must be life within a social group. Schools must be democratic communities wherein children live natural, democratic lives with their companions and grow into adulthood with good citizenship a part of their experience.4

Homogeneous grouping. — This term has been rather widely used in the same sense as ability grouping in educational literature, but several writers have pointed out the difference between the two terms, and probably

4 G. W. Frazier and W. D. Armentrout, An Introduction to Education, Chapter II.
it would be well if a distinction were made here. Parl West has made a rather extensive investigation of the definitions given by various experts in the field, but for the purposes of this study it is unnecessary that all of these be reviewed.5 Perhaps the definition of homogeneous grouping which best describes the particular kind of grouping practiced in the school in which the study was made is the following: Homogeneous grouping attempts a finer classification than is afforded by grades, while ability grouping is an attempt at a new kind of classification rather than refinement of traditional classification.6 "These [ability] groups may or may not be as homogeneous as the groups mentioned above. The purpose is not more efficient teaching of traditional subject matter, but the providing for different needs of different groups through differentiated curricula."7 This last quotation definitely defines the grouping in the situation described by the writer as homogeneous, and not ability grouping. The method by which this grouping is done, described in the first part of this chapter, may also be taken as a part of the definition of homogeneous grouping, when referring to grouping in Jackson school.

Heterogeneous grouping.--In general heterogeneity is taken to mean the direct opposite of homogeneous grouping; however, this conception is not strictly in accordance with facts. Heterogeneous grouping, as used

---


7Ibid.
in the present study, will mean organization of groups as they occur naturally in the school life. It can be defined best, perhaps, negatively by saying that heterogeneous groups are formed in the school when homogeneous grouping is not practiced. It is fairly well recognized that even groups homogeneous in one particular trait are highly heterogeneous in all others.

Related Studies

Educational literature contains a rather large amount of material dealing with homogeneous grouping, and with ability grouping, and there have been a comparatively large number of studies of the problem, using the experimental technique; however, for the purposes of the present study it is unnecessary to make a complete review of literature in the field. Several writers, including Keliher,8 Purdom,9 and West,10 have reported in detail the work that has been done in the past in the field of grouping of students. Purdom, in particular, has classified the former methods of attack on the problem, roughly in chronological sequence. They are:

First: The Grouping of Children into Homogeneous Groups for Teaching Purposes on the Basis of Personal Opinion, and Measuring the Results in the Same Manner.11

Second: The Grouping of Pupils into Homogeneous Groups for Teaching Purposes on the Basis of Intelligence Tests, School Marks and Teachers' Opinions, with the Results Measured by Personal Opinions, by School Marks, and by Effects on Attendance.12

8Alice V. Keliher, A Critical Study of Homogeneous Grouping.
9T. Luther Purdom, The Value of Homogeneous Grouping.
Third: The Grouping of Pupils into Homogeneous Groups for Teaching Purposes on the Basis of Intelligence Tests Alone, or by Intelligence Tests Supplemented by School Marks, Past Records, and Teachers' Opinions, with the Measured Results Checked by the Use of Control Groups.\textsuperscript{13}

The statement of the problem and the discussion of the purpose of this study would seem to indicate that there is small relationship between this work and previous studies and experiments made. The chief point of differentiation between the present study and the three types outlined above is, of course, the fact that this study is not interested in determining a subject matter gain, but is, rather, interested in the effects of grouping on children outside of the area of pure academic learning. Sears hinted at the need for an attack from this angle when he said, "No amount of gain in academic learning can offset damage to individuals and to our type of social order by fixing undesirable mental complexes or by stimulating recognition of social classes."\textsuperscript{14} In all of the three types of investigations listed above the efficacy of homogeneous grouping as a means to better teaching of subject matter seems to be the point for determination.

Purdom's study itself is an investigation of the third type which he discussed.\textsuperscript{15} He listed the following eight claims made by the proponents of homogeneous grouping:

1. It makes possible more rapid progress of bright pupils.

\textsuperscript{13}Ibid., p. 16.

\textsuperscript{14}Jesse B. Sears, "Some Aspects of the Problem of Homogeneous Grouping," \textit{Educational Administration and Supervision}, XXII (October, 1936), 511.

\textsuperscript{15}Purdom, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 11.
2. It offers an opportunity to adapt teaching methods to the different levels of intelligence.
3. It creates more rivalry and causes pupils to put forth better efforts.
4. It makes the teaching much easier.
5. It eliminates many problems of discipline.
6. It reduces the number of failures.
7. It discourages the dull pupils less.
8. It makes possible an enriched curriculum.¹⁶

Very largely his problem was one of considering the results of his experiment in the light of these claims. The experiment, begun in 1923, was limited to a comparison of achievement in only two subjects, English and algebra, and standard tests were used to measure gains in both the experimental and control groups set up. The major conclusions reached are as follows:

1. Pupils in homogeneous sections do not gain more than pupils in heterogeneous sections, when the results are measured by standard tests.
2. Pupils in homogeneous sections make lower semester grades in English, but higher in algebra.
3. Pupils in homogeneous sections do not cover more course material.
4. The semester grades do not show that the pupils in the homogeneous sections put forth greater efforts.
5. The gains made on the standardized tests and the semester grades do not show that the pupils of any degree of intelligence were favored by homogeneous grouping.
6. Homogeneous grouping on the basis of the intelligence test does not reduce failures.¹⁷

Definitely this study concerns itself almost exclusively with gains in academic learning under homogeneous and heterogeneous grouping, and therefore does not invade the field proposed as the scope of the present study.

Marvin Y. Burr made a similar approach to the problem of grouping, although his major interest was a determination of the degree of

¹⁶Ibid., p. 36. ¹⁷Ibid., p. 92.
overlapping in achievement in various subjects within the various sections grouped homogeneously and the value of homogeneous grouping for eliminating the need for individual adjustments. In setting up the experiment various criteria were used for grouping, such as average educational age, teachers' judgments, achievement scores, probable learning rate score, and intelligent quotient. Some 3400 children in six cities were participants in the study, and a variety of standardized tests were used to measure the progress of the pupils in the various subject fields. He concluded that:

1. There is great overlapping of achievement of groups as sectioned in the study.
2. On the average 78% of the total grade range of achievement is found in each section of a grade.
3. When groups are made non-overlapping in achievement in one subject, such as reading, they overlap greatly in other subjects such as arithmetic.
4. Individual pupils are not themselves homogeneous in physical or mental traits, nor in achievement in school subjects.
5. Clearly, homogeneous grouping does not do away with the problem of making individual adjustments.
6. The problem of meeting individual needs by means of homogeneous grouping is only slightly reduced.

Although Burr's attack on the problem was different from that applied by Purdom, it is quite clear that there is no question of close similarity between it and the present study. Again academic learning is the basis of comparison between experimental homogeneous groups and heterogeneous control groups, whereas in the present study no attempt is made to set up experimental and control groups and, as has been mentioned before,


implications for democracy and not academic learning is the point of
departure for attack on the problem of homogeneous grouping.

Rufus M. Hartill conducted an experiment in a number of the elementary
schools of New York City in 1931-32, which is of interest chiefly because
all children participating were grouped both homogeneously and hetero-
geneously for one semester each during the year in which the study was
made. The teachers remained with their original groups throughout the
entire period of the study so that they, too, had experience in teaching
both homogeneous and heterogeneous groups. Two forms of the New Stanford
Achievement Test were used to determine gains in various subject matter
fields during and at the conclusion of the experiment. Most significant
of the findings of this study was that the bright children grouped hetero-
geneously made larger gains in the subject matter tested than when grouped
homogeneously, except in the single field of reading, while the dull chil-
dren precisely reversed the position and made larger gains when grouped
homogeneously. The normal children, it was found, did equally well
under both groupings.

Hartill's study, because if confines itself with academic learning
gains, belongs to that group of experiments in homogeneous grouping which
have been devoted, apparently, to a refinement of the techniques used to
assure an accurate measure of these gains, and therefore is entirely out-
side the field of the present study.

Parl West's study of ability grouping is concerned primarily with a

---

20 Rufus M. Hartill, Homogeneous Grouping as a Policy in the Elementary
Schools in New York City.
21 Ibid., p. 36. 22 Ibid.
determination of the degree to which grouping of children reduced vari-
bility of educational achievement in schools in which an attempt was made
to adjust the curriculum to the needs of the various groups.\textsuperscript{23} His find-
ings indicated that there is a comparatively slight advantage in favor
of ability grouping with regard to the reduction of variability of educa-
tional achievement, though his figures are not impressive and do not ap-
pear to be highly significant.\textsuperscript{24} This study is another pointed toward
a determination of certain factors as evidenced by subject matter gains,
and therefore is entirely outside the realm of the present study.

An interesting study is that reported by Lillian Portenier, who, in
1923, gathered voluminous data, including intelligence quotients, me-
chanical aptitude scores, socio-economic status ratings, physical traits,
school marks, and vocational choices of accelerated and retarded groups
of Lincoln, Nebraska high school freshmen.\textsuperscript{25} Twelve years later data
were gathered on many of the same individuals for the purpose of determin-
ing how well adjusted they were to their environment at that time. Her
conclusion seems to damn homogeneous grouping with faint praise when she
says, "It seems reasonable to conclude that classification into differ-
entiated groups did not prove detrimental to these pupils."\textsuperscript{26} The approach
applied in this problem was quite a departure from the others described
heretofore and is related to the study made by the writer insofar as it

\textsuperscript{23}\textit{West}, \textit{op. cit.} pp. 2-3. \textsuperscript{24}\textit{Ibid.}, pp. 61-62.

\textsuperscript{25}Lillian Portenier, "Twelve-Year Study of Differentiated Groups
of High-School Pupils," \textit{Journal of Educational Psychology}, XXIX (January,
1938), 1-13.

\textsuperscript{26}\textit{Ibid.}, p. 13.
takes into consideration, at least to some extent, the effect of homogeneous grouping on individuals in their capacity as members of society, though, of course, no attempt was made to determine, either experimentally or philosophically, the traits needed by the integrated individual functioning in the social setting.

Probably the most comprehensive of many analyses of homogeneous grouping is that of Alice V. Keliher. The mode of attack in this study was the setting up of certain assumed positions relating to measurement, homogeneity, curriculum, and the school and society, with the listing of a number of statements supporting the position assumed, followed by a philosophical analysis of the various positions. In the analysis of assumptions concerning the attitudes of pupils Keliher resorted to an experimental technique for the purpose of supplementing the philosophical findings. An arrangement was made whereby she observed for a number of hours in various progressive heterogeneously grouped classes for the purpose of recording responses of the children which might or might not indicate reparation and discouragement, which several writers supporting the assumption relating to children's attitudes stated would be found prevalent in groups not arranged homogeneously. A study of these responses indicated that there was no justification for the belief that heterogeneous grouping was conducive to discouragement. She further stated that when the school ceased the emphasis of the competitive aspect of work, discouragement of slow children ceased to be a factor with which to contend. This experiment in connection with the attitudes of children touches slightly on the present study, though the attitudes in which this study is interested are

\[27\text{Keliher, op. cit.}\] \[28\text{Ibid., p. 129.}\]
those indicative of satisfaction or dissatisfaction on the part of the pupil with the school situation, while Keliher was interested in attitudes from the standpoint of the repressions and discouragements claimed by proponents of homogeneous grouping to result from the grouping of children heterogeneously. Other conclusions drawn by Keliher have no direct bearing on the present study.

The National Society for the Study of Education has devoted two of its yearbooks, the Twenty-Third and the Thirty-Fifth, Part One, to a comprehensive study of grouping in American schools. The latter, published in 1936, probably represents the most widely accepted general work on the subject yet published. The first chapter in this book, that by Warren W. Coxe, has some rather pertinent implications for the present study, as the following quotation indicates:

If we are serious in a desire to interpret democracy in present-day terms, education must offer not the same program to all, but an equal opportunity for all varieties of interests and abilities to find and develop their potentialities. This interpretation does not imply that the school should decide the destination of pupils; it is the responsibility of the pupil to find his place under guidance in a wide variety of offerings. The school must help all levels to work together harmoniously, realizing that each level and each individual is but part of a great social organization. Groups so organized that pupils can work together within them, and at the same time develop the techniques of group interaction, can have a definite part in building up this kind of democratic social order.29

The present study is primarily interested in determining, at least tentatively, whether or not homogeneous grouping, as practiced in the particular situation described, can be compatible with the needs and purposes of democratic society today. Coxe concludes that groups have an

important place in the schools educating for democracy, and this conclusion is not questioned. The present study is concerned not with grouping in general, but only as applied to the particular situation examined.

In Chapter II an effort will be made to analyze the present-day and historical world-wide and national setting in which education, and its component factors, such as homogeneous grouping, operate. It is the conviction of the writer that any attempt to solve educational problems can be realistically undertaken only with an understanding of that problem in its context within the larger pattern of society. The following chapter is the attempt to gain that requisite understanding.

\footnote{Ibid., p. 18.}
CHAPTER II

EDUCATION IN AMERICAN DEMOCRACY

The Crisis in Democracy

Some two years ago Boyd Bode\(^1\) arrested the attention of American educators with the pronouncement that progressive education had reached the cross-roads of its very existence. Today, with candor, it may be stated unequivocally that American democracy, as well, has become snarled in a world-wide traffic jam; a traffic jam at which no cool-headed cop has appeared to preside. At least twice before in its history democracy in America has faced stern crises, yet today, few will deny, a crisis more ominous, partially because of its complexity, faces almost the last, and always the greatest of the world's democracies.

The International Scene

In bewilderment and unbelief Americans have seen their sister republic of France ground into humiliating and even unheroic defeat, while on the opposite side of the English Channel the "tight little isle" roars unconvincing defiance at the foe. And her defiance is unconvincing because there is suspicion abroad that democracy in England has feet of clay, not to mention a head of wood. Tardily the "Colossus of the West" has thrown herself into an orgy of preparedness, callously and with good will spending billions for armament where a year ago there

\(^1\)Boyd Bode, *Progressive Education at the Crossroads*. 
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were only millions, squeezed with little grace in a stop-gap effort to rearm democracy at home, where, if democracy is to be saved, it must be saved first, in the hearts and minds of the people. It has been said:

Our own job must come first. We cannot save democracy abroad while we fumble our own. We can show our concern for the rest of the world and for civilization and for future generations in no way more effectively than by discovering how to plan for abundance and how to find freedom for ourselves.2

World-wide abundance a possibility

Two years ago, or even a year ago, Americans were still, as they had been for some ten years previous, interested chiefly in the tremendous problem of bringing to the United States, not bringing back as some would have us believe, the prosperity for all which has been the will-o'-the-wisp since man first began to stand upright on his two hind legs. For all the centuries since man began his long and oft-detoured trek up the ladder toward the better life, true prosperity, abundance for all, has been beyond the realm of possibility, builded only of the stuff of which dreams are made. However, within the last fifty years, and especially within the last twenty or twenty-five, the mirage of abundance has been seen, from afar, to possess substance.

Scarcity versus abundance

Particularly within the last five years the American people, and the people of the other democratic-capitalistic nations, have been stunned to see Germany and Italy, and to a lesser degree Soviet Russia, break the chains which have manacled the human race since time began and emerge

2 Alfred M. Bingham, Man's Estate, p. 424.
into the Promised Land of abundance; albeit an abundance of guns and airplanes and bombs, instead of an abundance of butter and bread and beef. Too late has France, and perhaps even England, learned that the scarcity system applied to armament, not to mention when applied to butter, is inadequate when pitted against a plenty system producing armament. Today it might be said, without fear of successful contradiction, that the American people have very largely relegated into the limbo of forgotten things all thoughts of bringing about in America, for the present at least, that abundance of consumer goods which at times, since 1933, has seemed to be so near at hand. All energies, all prayers, all thoughts strive in the summer of 1940 for abundance of just one kind—death-dealing instruments. And yet, no one can deny that at the present time there seems to be an urgent need for arms. But isn't it so that the very lack of abundance in a world of potential plenty with which the Treaty of Versailles hamstringed both Germany and Italy has not only side-tracked the world-wide surge for consumer goods, but has made an abundance of destruction a necessity? Thus, the very forces which prevent abundance apparently make war its only substitute.

The Domestic Scene—Summer, 1940

The New Deal

Eight years of the New Deal are rapidly drawing to a close, but little thought would have been given to it in these United States during the past three months had it not been for the plaintive cries that the Republicans raised against it from time to time, cries which reached a crescendo at the twenty-second national Republican Convention held in
Philadelphia. And yet the New Deal, good, bad, or indifferent, is or was America's attempt to answer the most pressing problem which has faced her democracy since the agricultural aristocracy of the old South and the new industrial aristocracy of the North fought out their differences on the chessboard of Bull Run and Vicksburg and Gettysburg, using as their pawns the common people of both sections. Today, more than seven years after the auspicious birth of what was to have been a new deal, many, if not most of the problems which faced the nation on March 4, 1933, remain unsolved—some of them not even tackled. Perhaps as much has been done as was possible under the circumstances. There can be little doubt that accomplishments under Roosevelt have been greater than those which could have been made under many another leader, however, much remains to be done.

1940—election year

The Republican nomination.—Amid the bedlam and confusion of a world in the throes of war that peculiarly American institution, the Republican Party Convention, has functioned apparently in its traditional pattern. The results in 1940, however, demonstrate a striking difference from results in years past. A business man, a utility executive, a member and not merely a representative of the Few, has been nominated as the G. O. P. choice for president of the United States. In other years the Republican Party, that minion of the monied few, has been content to place before the electorate such men as Harding, Coolidge, and Landon—liveried lackies of the "Rulers of America." In 1940 the elite have shrugged aside discretion and have entered one of their own select number, though of course he
could hardly be classified as being a member of the inner circle of American aristocracy. Wilkie has announced that he will campaign on a platform aimed at Unity, Defense, and Recovery. The question remains, however, who is to be defended, what segment of our population will recover, and what the basis of unity will be. With his personal record in mind, and the record of the Republican Party at hand, it would not seem plausible to trust that the masses of the American people will be the chief beneficiaries should he be elected.

Roosevelt renominated.--On the other hand the Democrats have nominated as their candidate the man who represents to most Americans the spearhead of liberal government. Their plea to the voter is likely to rest on the tried and proven strategem of "don't change horses in the middle of the stream." Whether or not the New Dealers can overcome the old American aversion to the third term idea remains to be seen. The Gallup poll showed a majority against the re-election of Roosevelt early in the spring of 1940, but with the invasion by the Nazis of the Lowlands and France, Rooseveltian popularity skyrocketed once again.

Issues in the campaign.--The presidential campaign of 1940, it is beginning to seem, will be freighted with tremendous implications for democracy, not only in America but for the world. It is unfortunate that the modern propaganda tools—the newspapers, the radio, and the movies—have already so muddied the water for most people that the issues on which the campaign will be fought out are even now indistinct.

4The Dallas Morning News, June 16, 1940, Section IV, p. 9.
Nevertheless, the issues are these: liberalism versus conservatism, human rights versus property rights, the Many versus the Few, abundance versus scarcity. On the first Tuesday after the first Monday in November, 1940, the question of how well education has educated for democracy will be rather conclusively answered.

Crisis in America's back yard

Since the hour that der Fuehrer's mechanized blitzkriegers crossed the borders of Holland, Belgium, and Luxembourg, America has become allergic in the most acute form to Hitlerism. A gnawing fear that America cannot rearm fast enough to meet the new peril has gripped almost every breast, and Congress, for a change once again obedient to the opinion of the American people, has cast itself into a frenzy of appropriation for national defense. Billion has been added to billion for America's armed forces in the feverish hope that dollars taxed from the poor, can undo the damage done by privilege and greed riding rough-shod over human rights. There is serious doubt, however, whether even dollars will be sufficient to overcome century-long animosities held by the Latin-American nations for their Uncle Sam, and it is in Central and South America that the United States realizes she has her Achilles heel. Due to the fact that these nations represent a veritable Utopia of raw materials, desperately needed by the totalitarian-geared economies of Western Europe and at the same time a dry-sponge market, eager to absorb an abundance of consumer goods, both the Nazi barter system and American capitalism must perforce resolve their differences, one way or the other, in the lands south of the Rio Grande. Ominous for us is the fact that the Latin-American, despite
recent "good-neighbor" policies, has for the United States a deep and abiding distrust, born and nurtured by Yankee imperialism and greed.

American Democracy in Perspective

Foundation stones

The Declaration of Independence.--One hundred and sixty-four years ago this past Fourth of July a pitiful little group of English colonists announced their intention of becoming separate and apart from the mother-country in what is recognized as one of the most deathless documents to be found in human history––the American Declaration of Independence. Although we now realize that in part the Declaration was an instrument of propaganda, designed to catch and hold the imagination of the colonists long enough for independence to be won, it still represents to the masses of the people of this land the ideal toward which American civilization is, or at least should be, striving. For most Americans the word Democracy has meaning in the light of the paragraph which reads:

We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness. That to secure these rights, Governments are instituted among Men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed. That whenever any Form of Government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the Right of the people to alter or to abolish it, and to institute new Government, laying its foundations on such principles and organizing its powers in such form, as to them shall seem most likely to effect their Safety and Happiness. Prudence, indeed, will dictate that Governments long established should not be changed for light and transient causes; and accordingly all experience hath shown, that mankind is more disposed to suffer, while evils are sufferable, than to right themselves by abolishing the forms to which they are accustomed.5

5The American Declaration of Independence.
The Constitution.—Nearly a decade and half after the Declaration of Independence was enunciated, after the war with England had been concluded, and after the colonies had discovered by bitter experience that government invested with too little power could be almost as bad as government with too much power, representatives of the various colonies met in Philadelphia for the purpose of making some arrangement whereby gains made under the influence of the Declaration of Independence would not be totally nullified by disunity among the various members of the American experiment. Since there was no duress to force the delegates to agree on anything, the Constitution, born in that convention, was ushered into the world through the mid-wifery of compromise. However, in America even today, there is no compromise with the acceptance of the purposes as stated in the Preamble of the Constitution.

We the People of the United States, in order to form a more perfect Union, establish Justice, insure domestic Tranquility, provide for the common defence, promote the general Welfare, and secure the Blessings of Liberty to ourselves and our Posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution of the United States of America.

These documents, then, are the foundation stones upon which American democracy rests. Their solidness and steadfastness depend not so much on their own inherent make-up, but more on the inherent lack of steadfastness in human nature. It is through no fault of either that there is little promotion of the general Welfare; that there can be little pursuit of Happiness, even in America, in a war-torn world; that Justice for many elements in American society has not been established; and that we are not so sure that we have secured for ourselves and our Posterity the

6 The Constitution of the United States of America.
Blessings of Liberty. Even the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution must be implemented by the practice of true democracy by the people who revere and profess loyalty to them.

Adjustment and development

Even a competent and fair-minded observer of American Democracy today, were he unable to obtain the record of the past, would likely assume that even at its best democracy in America probably never had existed except as a set of forms. Judging from the facts of the present he might believe that the American people had also in the past so willingly and completely accepted and practiced the form rather than the substance of democracy. History shows, however, that there was a time when democracy was the way of life in almost all of the institutions of the United States. In the beginning the American people were conscious of the responsibility placed upon them because of their attempt to set up a government of, by, and for themselves. Washington, in his first inaugural address said: "The preservation of the sacred fire of liberty, and the destiny of the republican model of government, are justly considered as deeply, perhaps as finally staked, on the experiment intrusted to the hands of the American people." Some thirty years later Daniel Webster, in his Bunker Hill Oration, said much the same thing when he pointed out the results to liberty all over the world should the American attempt at self-government be proved a failure. He said:

---

If, in our case, the representative system ultimately fail, popular government must be pronounced impossible. No combination of circumstances more favorable to the experiment can ever be expected to occur. The last hopes of mankind, therefore, rest with us; and if it should be proclaimed, that our example had become an argument against the experiment, the knell of popular liberty would be sounded throughout the earth. 8

In his address on the Battlefield of Gettysburg another great American, Abraham Lincoln, appealed to the people on the basis of their love and loyalty to the spirit of democracy, while in more modern times both Teddy Roosevelt and his cousin, Franklin D. Roosevelt, have called to the attention of the American people their place and importance in the attempt to make democracy work.

Economic democracy.—Perhaps the most significant observations made of the American civilization of a hundred years ago were those of a foreigner, Alexis de Tocqueville, who found in the United States the very antithesis of the economic aristocracy rife at the time in Europe. He began his analysis of the American scene with reference to the economic situation.

Amongst the novel objects that attracted my attention during my stay in the United States, nothing struck me more forcibly than the general equality of conditions among the people. I readily discovered the prodigious influence which this primary fact exercises on the whole course of society; it gives a peculiar direction to public opinion, and a peculiar tenor to the laws; it imparts new maxims to the governing authorities, and peculiar habits to the governed.

I soon perceived that the influence of this fact extends far beyond the political character and the laws of the country, and that it has no less empire over civil society than over the government; it creates opinions, gives birth to new sentiments, founds novel customs, and modifies whatever it does not produce. The more I advanced in the study of American society, the more I perceived that this equality of condition is the fundamental fact from which all others seem to

be derived, and the central point at which all my observations constantly terminated. 9

It is not strange that the Frenchman found equality of economic status so widespread in the United States, since the old forms of feudalism were forced to vanish under the conditions of the new continent. An abundance of land, undreamed of richness of natural resources, and the very spirit of the people who had broken the bonds with friends and homes to come to the new world made equality a fact. Tench Coxe, Assistant Secretary of the Treasury under Hamilton made a rather extended trip through the states for the purpose of observation in the year 1794, and his report lends weight to the conclusions drawn later by Tocqueville. He observed:

It is probable that all the jewels and diamonds worn by the citizens of the United States, their wives and daughters are less in value than those which sometimes form a part of the dress of an individual in several countries of Europe. . . . There are no descriptions of men in America and very few individuals, at the active times of life, who live without some pursuit of business, profession, occupation, or trade. All the citizens are in active habits. 10

Since, with the exception of the plantations of the Southern states, the bulk of the population of the United States was made up of free-hold farmers, and since their access to any market was in the majority of cases extremely limited, it might be expected that there would be a more or less general equality of conditions as pictured by Coxe, and afterwards by Tocqueville.

Social democracy.—Not only was there equality of economic conditions


in the young United States, but the very equality of economic status made for equality of social status among all. Various writers of the time have indicated that even those who practiced professions and callings were of necessity forced to become farmers in order to support their families. Isaac Weld, Junior, an Irishman who visited the United States toward the close of the eighteenth century observed that "in the country parts of Pennsylvania" judges "are no more than plain farmers, who from their infancy have been accustomed to little else than following the plow." Much of the social equality was due no doubt to the ease with which a common laborer could become a land owner in his own right. John Bradbury, an English traveler, was particularly impressed that a common laborer could very easily acquire land and could associate with the sons and daughters of freehold farmers. Weld reported that the servants, such as he found in America, were independent and unruly, and he stated that they "only remain in service until they can save a little money, when they constantly quit their masters, being led to do so by that desire for independence which is so natural to the mind of men, and which every person in America may enjoy that will be industrious." Bradbury suggested that "the European aristocrat, if he would travel pleasantly in

---

11 Isaac Weld, Jr., *Travels Through the States of North America and the Provinces of Lower Canada During the Years of 1795, 1796, and 1797*, I, 130, quoted in Counts, *The Prospects of American Democracy*, p. 27.


America, should leave his sense of superiority in the Old World."14
Many of the visitors to America, accustomed as they were to the servility and self-effacement of the European servant, were shocked and chagrinned to find that American hostlers, maids, and waiters demanded that they be treated as equals. This was true, of course, chiefly in the Northern states since in the South the negro slave was an obedient and faithful servant, much after the model of the European domestic. Thus it was that a high degree of social equality was attained and practiced in the early days of the nation.

**Political democracy.**—History books for generations have extolled the struggle, successful according to the historians, of the American people to obtain political democracy. Too often these chroniclers allow their readers to come to the conclusion that with the capitulation of Cornwallis and the adoption of the Constitution American political democracy became an over-night reality; however, nothing could be farther from the truth. As a matter of fact, when measuring our accomplishments along this line against the ideals set forth in the Declaration of Independence and the Preamble of the Constitution, we find that even in 1940 democracy has not been entirely achieved. Notwithstanding, it is probably remarkable that the people of the United States have attained the degree of political democracy which we now enjoy. It has been pointed out that to a large degree success has been conditioned by an unusual set of propitious circumstances in the world-wide situation.

The first point to be emphasized is that the American people,

---

to an unusual degree, have been the heirs of the modern world. The
discovery, settlement, and development of America coincided with the
breakup of the medieval system, the rise of the middle class, the
overthrow of the feudal economy, the growth of private capitalism,
the spread of parliamentary institutions, the disestablishment of the
church, and all of those great humanistic and liberating movements
of the past five centuries—the Renaissance, the Reformation, the
Enlightenment, the English and French revolutions, the advance of
science, the undermining of authoritarianism in the church, the state,
and the ordinary relationships of life.¹⁵

Following the establishment of the government under the Constitution
there was a shaky period in the nation's history immediately succeeding
the administrations of Washington and John Adams. The forces of conserva-
tism and reaction, including Alexander Hamilton and Gouvernor Morris, saw
the dangers to prestige inherent in democracy. During the campaign before
the election of Jefferson every invective was hurled at the man who was
to be the third president of the republic; however, the crisis passed
without doing irreparable damage when the people refused to be duped by
propaganda spread by the privileged few and elected Jefferson. A genera-
tion passed and under Jackson a far greater degree of real democracy came
into being, though it was not until even later that universal white man-
hood suffrage became a reality in every state. Then it took four years
of fratricidal civil war to erase the blot of slavery from a nation that
had been dedicated to freedom more than three quarters of a century before.
Finally the vote for women came only after the World War had been fought,
while even today, in many of the Southern states the right to vote regard-
less of color, established by the fifteenth amendment, is abridged by
means of a property qualification—the poll tax.

Perhaps no better summary could be found regarding American democracy

¹⁵Counts, The Prospects of American Democracy, p. 34.
yesterday than a quotation from the writings of a Frenchman who visited
the United States in 1834. He wrote:

American society is essentially and radically a democracy, not
in name merely but in deed. In the United States the democratic
spirit is infused into all the national habits, and all the customs
of society; it besets and startles at every step the foreigner, who,
before landing in the country, had no suspicion to what a degree
every nerve and fibre had been steeped in aristocracy by a European
education. 16

Anti-Democracy

Democracy prospers

During the golden age of the nineteenth century democracy seemed to
be ever gaining strength and new converts, while passing from one con-
quest over ancient anti-democratic theories to another; nevertheless,
there was forming in the shadows a new and perhaps more deadly attack upon
the fundamental institutions and principles of democracy. In the rest of
the world, as in America, the giant strides by which political democracy
was wrested from the few was accompanied by a corresponding back-slide
in economic democracy. Merriam clearly points out the tendencies which
undermined democracy in the great so-called middle classes.

The defence of democracy remained with the middle-income groups,
who looked with disfavor upon large concentrations of economic power
whether in the form of land or capital, and on the other hand with
dislike upon a revolutionary program of collectivism. They held to
the values of liberty and equality in a democratic frame of political
association. They were weakened however by the defection of elements
of the proletarian group willing to sacrifice liberty for equality,
and by the defection of a capitalistic group who were willing to ex-
change equality for liberty in the form of laissez faire.

It was this struggle between competing claims of political and

16 Michael Chevalier, Society, Manners and Politics in the United
States, pp. 138-139, quoted in Counts, The Prospects of American
Democracy, p. 40.
economic liberty and equality that helped to prepare the way for the anti-democratic sentiment, theory, and forms of the twentieth century. The struggle was made all the sharper by the failure of social organization to keep pace with the rapid advance of technology, and to develop appropriate methods of economic and political stabilization. These difficulties were accentuated still more by the growth of intensely nationalistic sentiments on the one hand and on the other the failure to develop a jural order of the world in which local security might be set.17

Democracy threatened

While in the United States democracy took on new meaning under the influence of such leaders as Jackson, Lincoln, Theodore Roosevelt, and Woodrow Wilson the European philosophers Hegel, Saint Simon, Spengler and Nietzsche were preaching against the institutions of democracy while promulgating their own pet theories based upon the rule of the Few.18 Even Thomas Carlyle and John Ruskin, as well as the Spaniard, Ortega y Gasset, deplored the rule of the masses, believing that the rule of the many would bring about a general decay of cultural values in civilization.19 These three believed that the hope of civilization lay in the rule, not of the traditional English aristocrat, but in the newly arisen captains of industry. In America Alexander Hamilton is reported to have said: "Your people, your people, sir, is a great beast."20 Merriam states that Mallock, and others of his group, maintained that since all advancement was dependent upon industry, the industrialists should be

18Ibid., pp. 203-204. 19Ibid., p. 206.
given a free rein in the direction of their enterprises.\footnote{21}{Merriam, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 206.} Certainly in America we have heard, since about 1936, loud cries that industry must be allowed to work out its own and society's salvation. It should be remembered that these philosophers of another day did not live to witness the wisdom and aplomb with which the industrial and financial giants of 1929 handled the great depression. After four years of a futile attempt to save themselves they came and cast themselves at the feet of a new messiah, only to turn upon him when they had passed the most treacherous quicksands and felt themselves once more on solid ground.

Modern despotisms

Of greatest interest to moderns are the new despotisms of Italy, Germany, and Russia. Although the three great totalitarian states are grouped together, their origins were dissimilar, since Russia's dictatorship is, theoretically at least, only a step in the communistic revolution which promised in the beginning to bring about a better world for the worker. On the other hand Italy and Germany started out as despotisms of the right; not steps toward something else, but ends in themselves.

\textbf{Communism.}--Communist doctrine is indeed anti-political, as well as anti-capitalistic and anti-Christian, in the last analysis.\footnote{22}{Ibid., p. 227.} According to the dogma of communism the state is conceived as an instrument of the capitalist class over the proletariat, and that, with the establishment of a one-class society, the state will simply wither away.\footnote{23}{Ibid.} Today, however, it is impossible to determine how far the dictatorship of Stalin has gone in approaching the form and purpose of Hitler's despotism. It
seems clear that there are still large elements in Soviet Russia which have benefited but little; have in fact but traded the tyranny of the tears for the terror of Stalin.

The forms of democracy and totalitarianism.--In Germany and Italy, while roundly condemning the principles and instrumentalities of democracy, Hitler and Mussolini have not yet abandoned many of the forms common to democratic states. In each case representative bodies still meet, though their function is that of ratification, rather than of discussion and compromise. In each country is to be found a "party," though the absence of any opposition group makes the party system meaningless, while at irregular intervals plebiscites are held, although the sacredness of the right and privilege of suffrage in a country where terror is substituted for freedom of speech, press and assembly is subject to some question, at least from the democratic point of view.

Symbolism.--In both Germany and Italy much use has been made of symbolism of a variety of description, and in the former, in particular, the hocus-pocus of racial superiority and racial destiny has played a large part in the capture of the popular imagination. None of the innovations introduced by Mussolini and his protege, however, represent large departures from the autocracies of history. In fact, the pogroms instituted against the Jews have their counterparts in Spanish, Russian, and English history, while the Nazi swastika is said to be the ancient Indian symbol of fertility, borrowed from the Hindus by Hitler.

The elite in the totalitarian states.--The Communist Party in Soviet Russia, the Fascist Party in Italy, and the National Socialist Party in Germany constitute the elite in each country, though close examination
fails to reveal any particular qualities possessed by these elite.

The requirements for party membership of belief in the doctrines of the group; loyalty to its leaders; absence of negative demerits indicating unfitness for any group service, such as excessive dissipation or disorderliness; and lastly, positive qualities of a type useful in any group, fail to differentiate party members from members of almost any other group which might be mentioned.\textsuperscript{24} There seems to be, therefore, no underlying firm foundation of tradition in the modern despotisms such as that upon which the old nobility and royalty were founded. Nevertheless, Counts professes to see in the popular character of the contemporary despotisms their most alarming threat to democracy.\textsuperscript{25}

Herriman's analysis of the strength of the modern despotisms is more optimistic.

The new Autocrats promise a sounder system of social and economic order on one hand and on the other a sounder system of international relations. Thus far this has not appeared. In the task that lies before us of reconstructing sections of the social-economic order that have been outgrown, cooperation and consent are of greater importance than arbitrary decision and violence. Psychiatry will be more effective than surgery. The mass industrial organization of our times will require mass cooperation for its successful operation rather than decisions handed down from above, and if resisted, re-enforced by the Terror. The organization of violence and the chicanery of propaganda will be found inferior at this point to the organization of consent and the processes of discussion and persuasion.

Externally a sounder system of international relations is modern in tendency, but to assume that this reorganization will be brought about by force of individual states places a heavy strain upon the imagination, unless we assume that one nation triumphs over all others, or that several groups swallow up the others. But unless one alone emerges, there is no peace until some form of juridical order is constructed. If any one is strong enough, he may end the anarchy of nations by the strong rule of his law; but otherwise we arrive at nothing but international chaos, with its inevitable effect upon

\textsuperscript{24}\textit{Ibid.}, p. 224. \textsuperscript{25}Counts, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 170
local organization and process. Higher standards of human living will emerge more steadily from peaceful industry than from war.\textsuperscript{26}

Opposing industrial systems.--Today, after witnessing the results of the blitzkreig against Holland, Belgium, and France, not to mention Denmark and Norway, less comfort is to be found in the words just quoted. It is more than just rank dreaming to assume that one nation might triumph over all others, for it is just this possibility that has sent America into a frenzy of defense preparations. To date there has been little evidence to support the contention that modern mass industry thrives with more efficiency in an atmosphere of consent than in one of arbitrary decisions. In fact, if one is to assume that French, and for that matter English industry, too, represent the former and German industry the latter, the overwhelming weight of evidence favors industry directed by arbitrary decisions. However, we are not yet ready to assume that Allied industry represents industry governed by consent. It is easier to believe that we do have rather convincing proof that industry, manacled to the outmoded forms of capitalism, is certainly no match for totalitarian industry, so in the main Merriam's thesis remains unshattered by test. There is little evidence to substantiate the belief that industry in Tory England and Rightist France has even attempted to test the efficiency of the mechanisms of democratic control. It is true that the American press is making a desperate attempt to convince the United States that the processes of consent in industry were tried and found wanting under the Blum regime in France of several years ago; however, this particular red herring fails to detract from the fact that France and England, during nine months

\textsuperscript{26}Merriam, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 238.
of powder-puff warfare failed miserably to attain efficiency in industry operating under the very system which our newspapers are attempting to defend.

Autocratic forces in America

John Taylor, astute observer of conditions in America a hundred years ago, stated that any age can detect the frauds of an aristocracy of the past, while at the same time idly permitting the depredations of an existing privileged group.27 Certainly this seems to be our position today. The story of the concentration of wealth in the hands of a few in this country is thoroughly documented, though it is not known nearly so widely as it should be. Beginning in the time of John Quincy Adams and continuing to the present the insatiable greed of Americans for wealth has left a dirty path of wanton destruction, crime, and waste on the pages of our history. America's imperialistic wars played their part by adding to the public domain open to pillage, while the Civil War and the World War served to further entrench the Few in their positions of privilege. As has been mentioned, economic aristocracy in this country grew alongside political democracy, so that today a tremendous question must be resolved between the forces of democracy and those of autocracy. Counts says that:

In theory at least the American people are in a position to make their political institutions serve their purposes. An informed, determined, and united popular will cannot be thwarted long at the polls. The question of the possibility of achieving such a will

---

in a society dominated by an economic aristocracy is the central problem of the present volume. 28

The question posed by Counts in his book, copyrighted in 1938, has even more immediate implications today. It has stepped from the pages of a book into the sphere of actuality, perhaps to be answered, at least partially, in the general election of 1940.

More than three generations ago Tocqueville perceived what we now recognize as the embryonic development of the new aristocracy in America. He wrote:

I am of the opinion, upon the whole, that the manufacturing aristocracy which is growing up under our eyes is one of the harshest which ever existed in the world; but at the same time, it is one of the most confined and least dangerous. Nevertheless, the friends of democracy should keep their eyes anxiously fixed in this direction; for if ever a permanent inequality of conditions and aristocracy again penetrate into the world, it may be predicted that this is the gate by which they will enter. 29

Then in 1885 Josiah Strong, "pioneer and prophet of social Christianity,"
showed that the Frenchman's prediction had unmistakably come to pass at even that early date.

It is useless for us to protest that we are democratic, and to plead the leveling character of our institutions. There is among us an aristocracy of recognized power, and that aristocracy is one of wealth. No heraldry offends our republican prejudices. Our ensigns armorial are the trademark. Our laws and customs recognize no noble titles; but men can forego the husk of a title who possess the fat ears of power. 30

The advance of the aristocracy.—If Josiah Strong was disturbed that

28 Counts, op. cit., p. 67.


an aristocracy of wealth had arisen in 1885, what would he have to say
to the situation which confronts us today? The rapid advance of tech-
nology in the fields of transportation, manufacturing, communication, and
mining has simply oiled the bearings upon which present-day American aris-
tocracy progresses, while the modern corporate form of business with the
legal sanctions which surround it have served to further entrench and pro-
tect the constantly growing power of the Few. On the other hand the
plight of the masses of the people has grown steadily worse. President
Roosevelt has said that he sees a third of the population of the United
States poorly fed, poorly clothed, and poorly housed.31 More and more
the land in which a hundred and twenty years ago equality of opportunity
was a reality has become a land populated with a stratified, and even a
class-conscious society. A little more than a year ago the newspapers
of America treated their readers to a rare sight—J. P. Morgan chatting
with King George of England at a garden party given by the President.
American aristocracy comes into its own—ruler speaks to ruler! Per-
haps applying the word ruler to King George is bandying the meaning of
the term.

In 1820 before the Massachusetts Constitutional Convention Daniel
Webster spoke the following words:

The freest government, if it could exist, would not long be
acceptable, if the tendency of the laws were to create a rapid
accumulation of property in a few hands, and to render the great
masses of the population dependent and penniless. In such a case
the popular power must break in upon the rights of property, or else
the influence of property must limit and control the exercise of
popular power. Universal suffrage, for example, could not long
exist in a community where there was great inequality of property.

31 The Dallas Morning News, January 21, 1936.
The holders of the estates would be obliged in such case, either in some way to restrain the right of suffrage, or else such right of suffrage would ere long divide the property.\footnote{Journal of Debates and Proceedings in the Convention of Delegates Chosen to Revise the Constitution of Massachusetts, Boston, 1853, pp. 311-312, quoted in Counts, The Prospects of American Democracy, p. 78.}

Counts enlarges upon Webster's conception as it applies to the present day:

The issue as Webster saw it is now drawn in the United States. During the intervening century the course of events has proceeded according to his formula and brought American democracy to the deepest crisis of its history. The "tendency of the laws" has been "to create a rapid accumulation of property in few hands." While the vast majority of the people cannot be described as penniless, they are dependent--dependent on the holders of property and the uncertainties of a highly unstable economic system for the opportunity of earning their bread. The struggle to change "the laws," the great legal conceptions which support the inherited social structure, is advancing. Will the "holders of estates" restrain the right of suffrage in some fashion and thus render their holdings secure from popular attack? Or will the people, exercising the right of suffrage, "divide the property" (to use Webster's over-simplified phraseology) and usher in a new order under which the "tendency of the laws" will make impossible the "accumulation of property in few hands?" Such is the stern choice which history presents to the citizens of the United States in this generation. In the recent words of their President, they must know that "the liberty of a democracy is not safe if the people tolerate the growth of private power to a point where it becomes stronger than their democratic state itself."\footnote{Counts, op. cit., pp. 78-79.}

Defense of democracy.--Thus briefly and probably inadequately have been pictured the forces which oppose democracy. Whether or not democracy is to grow, and therefore to live, depends very largely on how well the democratic assumptions are implemented. At this writing it appears that that task rests upon the collective shoulders of the people of the United States, and bears heavily on one of their greatest instrumentalities, public education.
A Program for Democracy

No attempt is made herein to justify the position that the preservation of democracy in America and in the world is a desirable end. To the citizen of the United States, conscious of the heritage that is his, the desirability of democracy is axiomatic. Though there may be agreement on democracy's desirability, there is, however, little common consent on what method or system shall be used to preserve it. There are many even who still blindly hold to the illusion that democracy, at least in America, is not threatened. Others cling just as tenaciously to the delusion that the only threat to democracy is the one which exists in Germany and Italy. The same group, more or less, believed a few years ago that the greatest threat to American democracy lay in what they called, with relish, "Red Russia." Still another group, and a very large group it is, judging by the results of the last two presidential elections, believes that the greatest threat to democracy lies within our own country, though it must be admitted that the events of the spring of 1940 have largely turned the attention of even this group toward the dangers they see inherent in a militant and victory-bloated Nazism.

Education involved

Only a meagre effort can be made here to outline a program for democracy, and particularly our own American democracy, though it is necessary perhaps, since the future of American education is inextricably bound up with the future of the parent pattern of democracy, to present some guideposts for a program from which education may take its bearings. Counts has said that:
American education, moreover, is inextricably involved in the fate of the democratic process. This is due in part to the broad truth that education, being intimately related to the structure and life of the society which it serves, is inevitably affected by every more or less profound change in that society. It is also due to the peculiarly intimate relationship which education has sustained historically to democracy in America. The former has been one of the most characteristic expressions of the latter. It is not too much to say that, on the one hand, the perpetuation of the democratic process is dependent in no inconsiderable measure on the spirit, program, and activities of the school; and that, on the other, education, as it has been commonly conceived and conducted in the United States, could not survive the destruction of that process.\(^{34}\)

Therefore it behooves us, as educators, to attempt to discover some common ground of consent regarding a program for the thing in which our immediate interest has its being and meaning.

Democracy and goals

Probably one of the most telling charges hurled by the leaders of the totalitarian states at the democratic system have been those directed against the fact that there is an apparent lack of goals toward which we may strive. There can be little question that one of the chief secrets of their power among their people, bewildered and afraid in the chaos and uncertainty that followed the end of the first World War, was the fact that they knew what they were doing and where they were going. On the other hand the democratic, or pseudo-democratic regimes that Hitler and Mussolini followed seemed to be hesitant, pusillanimous, and as uncertain as the people they had been elected to lead. Some of the same failings, it might be said, apparently harassed democracy in the United States, France, and England, though they were spared, possibly because they had been victorious in 1918, really troublous times between the end

\(^{34}\)Ibid., pp. 290-291.
of the war and 1929. Since the latter date there have been troubles enough, however. Another factor which may have helped to save the democratic nations from the fate of dictatorship visited upon Germany and Italy is the longer experience enjoyed by their peoples with the institutions of democracy. That the dictators have made a case against democracy as it has been practiced there is little question, for there has been precious little understanding and interest in goals toward which to work, and practically no program designed to systematically attack the barriers separating us from such goals as we could see. But there are goals, and there are programs, and it may be within the realm of education to present goals and to present programs so that the vital democratic process of consent will have at least the opportunity to refute the claims of the despots before it becomes too late.

It can be shown rather definitely that the luke-warm attitude of the so-called friends of democracy is in a large measure contributory to the impasses in which democracy finds itself today. Courts says:

In their theoretical advocacy the friends of democracy adopt a defensive or even an apologetic tone. The best they can say is that while democracy is not as good as it should be, it is not as bad as it might be. Cataloguing and commending its merits, conceding and lamenting its defects, and consciously balancing argument against argument, they arrive at the tentative conclusion that democracy is a trifle superior to any rival order of society and life, as if diverse social systems were readily commensurable. Moreover, in an age when great choices have to be made, when positive and determined social action has to be taken, democracy is denominated the middle way. Obviously if such a conception of democracy should prevail, its worst enemies could ask for nothing better. It would become a deceptive haven for the timid and vacillating, while the bolder spirits would enroll under banners representing positive and challenging philosophies and programs. As a matter of fact, democracy is by no means a middle way between extremes, lacking substance of its own and defined in terms of its opponents. It is another way—unique, radical, revolutionary—the most adventurous way that man has ever
taken—a way beset with difficulties and demanding the fullest possible development of the powers of the race.35

As for goals, are not they implicit in the assumptions quoted in the first chapter in the attempt to define democracy? Surely an increased understanding of and faith in these assumptions is a vital goal if the perpetuation of democracy is to be accomplished. To the economist economic goals loom large among the more general ends. Foremost among these are the goals of an economy of plenty, stability of the economic structure, and growth.36 From the standpoint of the sociologist we have still other goals, while the educator sees still others, although it is the latter who should, above all others, see all the goals in their proper relationships to one another. We lack not for goals, misunderstood though they are; we lack for agreement among the people as to the exact nature of the goals we seek and agreement on a program we shall follow in attaining the ends for which we strive.

A framework for a program

A broad framework in which any program for democracy must find its being, based upon the assumptions heretofore mentioned, is the following:

(1) A positive social program including the guaranty of full employment, of economic stabilization and security, of increasing productivity with equitable distribution of national gains; and a guaranty of minimum standards of living appropriate to our stage of civilization.

(2) Adequate machinery to make democracy work, including the sharpening of legislative organization and objectives, the further development of public administration, attention to plan making and planning of natural resources.

(3) The development of a system of jural order in the world, by force if necessary, through which war may be outlawed as an instrument of national policy by some effective form of understanding or

association and, in the interim, more intelligent adjustment of the relations between the organization of violence and the organization of consent in commonwealths.

(4) Faith in democracy's political ideals with (a) greater stress upon human values in the larger sense and (b) greater emphasis on the broad possibilities in the coming era of abundance.

Democracy's program must conform to the newer ideals and possibilities of our new day. It must guaranty a fair share in the vast gains of civilization, material and higher, to members of the democratic society if it is to survive under modern conditions. It must validate the assumptions of democracy in the everyday life of the community.37

A nine-point program

The program presented by Counts dovetails neatly within the structure outlined above, and for the average American presents more corners on which to hang his thinking.

First, the professed friends of democracy must have faith in political democracy; second, the ordinary citizen must obtain the knowledge necessary for a free man; third, the masses of the people must be organized as completely as possible; fourth, government must carry out popular mandates quickly and honestly; fifth, government must maintain a complete monopoly of the military and police power; sixth, civil liberties must be guaranteed to the entire population without fear or favor; seventh, all major campaigns of propaganda must be systematically and thoroughly exposed; eighth, the temper of the democratic process must be conserved and strengthened; and ninth, war must be avoided.38

Avoidance of war pertinent today.—There can be little quarrel with the points in the foregoing program; however, at the present moment, the last point, the avoidance of war, is peculiarly interesting to Americans. The situation which so many said couldn't happen here has happened. The fine phrases that were uttered in good faith fifteen, ten, five years ago are today as meaningless as gibberish. In many places in America the statements that were made just a year ago are heresy now.

A program for war avoidance.—It is interesting to read today, in the light of the civilization shattering events of the past few months, what the builder of that platform for democracy had to say about his ninth plank when he wrote it some two years ago. In part, he said:

The problem of avoiding war, either today or tomorrow, seems practically insoluble. Any possible line of action, whether negative or positive, is replete with hazards for American democracy. The simple truth is that the people of the United States do not hold in their own hands all the vital and controlling factors in the situation. Nevertheless the formulation of policy, based upon wide popular understanding, is preferable to blind drift. . . .

It is proposed here that such a policy should embrace at least nine points. First, the government of the United States should recognize the distinction in moral position between the states in conflict and employ its diplomatic power in support of the victim of aggression. Second, it should place an embargo on all trade with the aggressor and thus refuse to be a party to the violation of international law and treaties to which it is a party. The costs of the embargo should not be borne by the business enterprises and workmen immediately concerned but by society as a whole. Third, it should permit its citizens to aid the country attacked in every possible way. . . . Fourth, it should withdraw its own armed forces entirely from the area of conflict and place upon private citizens concerned all the risks involved in residence in the countries at war or in participation in the struggle. . . . Fifth, it should steadfastly refuse to be drawn into the war by any of those "incidents" which in the past have commonly led to such action. . . . Sixth, it should organize the internal economy and so control foreign trade that the country would be able to bear the economic dislocations flowing from the shocks of international struggle. . . . Seventh, it should strengthen the military defense of the nation so that a successful attack from without would be impossible. This should be undertaken without any intention of protecting distant possessions and economic interests. Eighth, it should individually and in cooperation with nations desirous of peace initiate and support all practicable measures designed to remove the present injustices in the distribution of the natural resources of the world. At no time should it permit itself to be drawn into an alliance intended to maintain the status quo. . . . Ninth, and most important of all, the American people should devote their energies to the establishment of such a reign of social justice at home that no political adventurer would be tempted to escape domestic difficulties by engaging in foreign quarrels.39
Dangers beset any program for avoidance of war. That there was danger inherent in following these proposals Counts was well aware.\textsuperscript{40} However, it may be truthfully said in his defense that there just isn’t any absolutely safe way to handle TMT; and as far as democracy is concerned, war is very definitely the high explosive with which it has to deal. In this connection, particularly with regard to the last “and most important of all” the proposals presented by Counts for the avoidance of war another writer has said:

We have been discussing the solution in terms of an economy of plenty. The solution is as imperative here in America as anywhere, and here is the only field where we Americans can effectively work out the solution, not as an abstract exercise, but as a real problem in a real world. In so far as we do work it out this country becomes to that extent immune from war.\textsuperscript{41}

Don’ts for social planners

It is unnecessary that an attempt be made in the present study to develop more fully the nine points in the program for democracy presented by Counts; however, while considering any program it would be well for the social planner—the planner for democracy—the educator—to keep in mind the “Don’ts” set down by Bingham in his most recent work.

1. Don’t let “going concerns” run down; keep the wheels turning.
2. Don’t try to change non-essentials; the essential changes are drastic enough to satisfy any would-be revolutionist.
3. Don’t scrap any existing institution or social habit you can use; a slight change of direction may be all that is necessary.
4. Don’t let the credit structure with its paper values collapse; otherwise you can’t observe rules 1 to 3.
5. Don’t attack any cherished social myth unnecessarily, while you are building new ones.
6. Don’t set yourself or your word magic up on any pedestal: we’re all in this together, and the more of us who can take an active

\textsuperscript{40}\textit{Ibid.}, p. 214. \textsuperscript{41}\textit{Bingham, op. cit.}, p. 439.
part in working our way out, the better for all concerned. This means no dictators, no orthodoxy.

7. Don't centralize any power or any function unless vital; automatic controls and decentralized administration are always to be preferred.

8. Don't bother with "ownership." The controls you want are almost never dependent on it.

9. Don't aim at the politically impossible; proposals are no good if they can't be passed as legislation and applied.

10. Don't try to do piecemeal what must be done in a lump; you can't jump over a ditch by a series of short tentative jumps; all non-essential steps, however, can be postponed and taken one at a time.42

Democracy's program shelved

Reflecting the temper of the times many people, though probably willing enough to make some sort of an attempt to get a program for America going in normal times, cannot be interested in such "prosaic" problems today. The American mind and curiosity is still turned by the spectacular and sensational, and the headlines, radio, and movies are telling a moving story of the blood and dirt and intrigue that is war. To the masses there are bigger things than bringing to America a program to assure the continuance, or maybe it is the rebirth, of democracy. It is more than mere coincidence that our domestic agents of propaganda are spending millions to keep our minds off of just such a program as Counts has suggested. In the minds of many people the war must be "won" by the rather depleted Allies before we can think of beginning, much less winning, that other war at home. Bingham, however, believes that we are attacking the wrong dragon first; that when the one is conquered the other will slink off into the blackness from whence it came.

To be sure, a picture of Europe suddenly waking up to find

42 Ibid., p. 379.
America had solved the problem of depression is a little fanciful. For all countries tend to move together under the same pressures, and before we reached a clearly recognizable degree of success other countries would be taking the same road. But my main point stands: give the democracies a cure for unemployment and economic insecurity, and the fear of totalitarian ideologies, whether communist or fascist, will begin to fade like a bad dream. The panic of the Western world in this year 1939 is due to its inner sickness, its guilty conscience, its ineffectiveness in the face of the dictatorships. Even as regards the brutal realities of armament we cannot keep up with the efficient pace of Germany today; but let us find a workable technique of economic organization, and our greater resources could soon outdistance her even in that fata nous race.43

These words, optimistic a year ago, fall upon disillusioned ears today. We may grant the main thesis; the question now is: will we, or can we, recover from our "inner sickness" in time?

The Traditional Place of Education

While we find no reference to education in the constitution of the United States, there is adequate evidence to show that the function was reserved intentionally by the Founding Fathers to the various states. There is reason to believe that the decision of those who drafted the Constitution to leave to the states the administration of education was a wise one, though there have been times in our history when education has been treated as a poor relation by many of the states. Even today there is a demand on the part of many of the friends of education that the Federal government step into the breach left in the support of the schools by the depression. Few, however, would advocate that the government in Washington should usurp the powers of direction so long held by the states. Money to equalize educational opportunities in the poorer states is being asked from the capitol, but the problem has been to divorce control from support.

43Ibid., p. 425.
The First Period

That certain of the renowned early Americans were deeply concerned with education is proved by many of their writings. Jefferson, generally remembered as the author of the Declaration of Independence, and as the third president of the United States, should be appreciated more for his unfailing advocacy of education as an essential to the perpetuation of democracy in America. Among his writings are to be found the following statements in regard to education:

If a nation expects to be ignorant and free, in a state of civilization, it expects what never was and never will be.44

Above all things I hope the education of the common people will be attended to; convinced that on their good sense we may rely with the most security for the preservation of a due degree of liberty.45

A system of general instruction, which shall reach every description of our citizens from the richest to the poorest, as it was the earliest, so will it be the latest of all public concerns in which I shall permit myself to take an interest.46

I think by far the most important bill in our whole code is that for the diffusion of knowledge among the people. No other sure foundation can be devised, for the preservation of freedom and happiness.47

It is clear that James Madison shared the views of Jefferson with regard to education as a safeguard for free institutions. He said:

46 Ibid., X, 102, quoted in Kilpatrick, The Teacher and Society, p. 7.
A popular government, without popular information, or the means of acquiring it, is but a prologue to a farce or a tragedy; or, perhaps both. Knowledge will forever govern ignorance; and a people who mean to be their own governors must arm themselves with the power which knowledge gives.48

Even John Adams, who is generally thought to have been one of the more conservative members of the early leaders group, clearly saw the necessity for widely diffused educational opportunity.

Education is more indispensable, and must be more general, under a free government than any other. In a monarchy, the few who are likely to govern must have some education, but the common people must be kept in ignorance; in an aristocracy, the nobles should be educated, but here it is even more necessary that the common people should be ignorant; but in a free government knowledge must be general, and ought to be universal.49

These excerpts from the writings of the early leaders of America are indicative of the trends of that early era. This period of the advocacy of the value of education in a democracy constitutes what is called the first period in the history of American Education.50 According to one writer this initial period drew to a close in the early part of the nineteenth century, when the second period, that of the establishment of the American system of free schools for all, began.51 This period, roughly from 1830 to 1890, corresponds with the period of growth and development of political democracy, and with the period of growth and consolidation of the present continental form of the United States. It might be added, too, that this was the period of individualism.


50Kilpatrick, The Teacher and Society, p. 4.
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rugged individualism, in which the attention of the people was diverted
to the task of becoming individually wealthy, largely at the expense of
what seemed to be at that time limitless natural resources.

The Second Period

The battle for free public education was fought out, in general,
between three more or less well-defined groups of Americans. In the
first group were the humanitarian and public-spirited citizens who appreciated the social need of education for the masses of illiterate and
ignorant poor, while in the second group were those handworkers—laborers
—who wished education for their own children, and for others, and who
saw in public education the most desirable and probably the only institu-
tion capable of satisfying their wants.52 Ranged against the first two
groups were the complacent well-to-do whose own children were educated
in private schools, and who refused to see any legitimate reason why
they should be taxed to support schools for the poor.53 These people
appear from this distance to have had about the same sort of attitude
toward the schools as was held at the time by the aristocracy in England.
That the great spokesman for education, Horace Mann, saw the lines of
cleavage we are sure, for he has pointed out in the following paragraphs
his views as to the position education must assume.

Surely nothing but universal education can counterwork this
tendency to the domination of capital and the servility of labor.
If one class possess all the wealth and the education, while the
residue of society is ignorant and poor, it matters not by what name
the relation between them may be called; the latter, in fact and in
truth, will be the servile dependents and subjects of the former.
But if education be equally diffused, it will draw property after

52 Ibid., p. 13. 53 Ibid.
it by the strongest of all attractions; for such a thing never did happen, and never can happen, as that an intelligent and practical body of men should be permanently poor. . . .

Education, then, beyond all other devices of human origin, is the great equalizer of the conditions of men—the balance-wheel of the social machinery. . . . It gives each man the independence and the means by which he can resist the selfishness of other men. It does better than to disarm the poor of their hostility toward the rich; it prevents being poor.54

It is probable that Mann, with all of his foresight, could see that in this present age other educational leaders would have to come to the same conclusions that he reached, though today it is becoming generally believed that education, in the sense that Horace Mann knew it, is and will be insufficient to turn the tide against privilege and greed. A discussion of the kind of education that will be needed is reserved for the final section of this chapter.

In retrospect, the job of getting a system of free public education for America was done, but those who fought throughout nearly three quarters of a century to attain it must have felt that accomplishment was slow. Today we may well question how it was possible for the friends of education to triumph over the forces that opposed them. Here is one answer:

And what decided the contest? We can easily believe that it was the conjunction of seen personal advantage with a growing sense of social justice and wisdom of the new policy. Probably the general movement of thinking was away from any notion of bare self-advantage toward a firmer grasp of the surer social justice and the deeper and wider wisdom of free public schools.55

Newton emphasizes that there is great significance in the relationship between the time the fight for free public schools was won with other


55 Kilpatrick, op. cit., pp. 22-23.
issues being decided favoring freedom and equality in the nation during the same period.

It was no mere matter of chance that free schools were established at the very time that property and religious qualifications for voting were being abolished and the principles of manhood suffrage firmly established.56

The Third Period

The third great period in the development of American education was that between 1890 and 1929, marked by the tremendous expansion of public school systems and of facilities.57 Another factor which differentiated this period from its predecessors and from the period immediately following was the unprecedented increase in attendance in the schools, and especially at the secondary and college and university levels. Though the increase in the higher levels of education is still noticeable today, the former steady rise in attendance in our high schools has for all practical purposes leveled off. The period also saw the establishment of graduate schools of education and their application of the scientific method to the study of education.58

But with all of its apparent progress education was still not meeting the needs of American democracy. In the latter days of the third period there seems to have been a definite lag on the part of education behind the very society of which it was, in the minds of some thinkers, duty-bound to serve as guide and leader. Charles A. Beard has said:

While business, agriculture, and labor became increasingly

56 Jesse H. Newlon, Education for Democracy in Our Time, p. 90.
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collective, education continued to lay stress on the very individualism against which the organized economies of the nation were fighting in the interest of fair practices, living wages, and just returns. Education became increasingly academic and "scientific" and lagged far behind the movement of great economic forces in national life. 59

There is little wonder that with the upheaval of our economy in the great depression education should find itself detached from familiar moorings, and therefore ripe to step into the next phase in which we now find ourselves. Here is the setting:

As we of today face our times, the fourth period of social-educational development, we need to renew the bold vision of the first period, with the changes of course that those men would make were they now here. In that day the social needs seemed largely met by political reconstruction with education to fit. In our day mere political freedom and democracy do not suffice. We must go on to industrial freedom and democracy. And education must not simply adjust itself to what is otherwise already settled; it must help America to see clearly its confronting situation of rapid change and to make up its mind more surely for appropriate action. In this process democracy must rule. The American nation must by initiative from within make up its own proper mind and carve out its own appropriate future. 60

**Education in a Dynamic Democracy**

**Education and Democracy Related**

As we have seen education and democracy are intertwined and interlaced one with another, though it must not be assumed that it is only in the case of democracy that a relationship with education exists. It may be hard for us to apply the term education to the process used by other systems of government for the promulgation and diffusion of their ideals and goals, but it must be ever kept in mind that certain processes,

---
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which we may prefer to call propagandizing instead of education, are used, and used to the utmost by the forces of anti-democracy to attain their ends. And American educators are beginning to realize that wherein the indoctrinators of Europe have succeeded we have to a very large extent failed. We are beginning to realize, too, that the problem which faces democracy and education is in wise the same problem which faces totalitarianism and education. The very factors which define totalitarianism as different from democracy enable those ideologies to apply techniques most effective for their purpose, while the practice of democracy, which has never been the easy way, rejects these same apparently most effective techniques on the grounds that they are incompatible with the very assumptions upon which democracy rests. There can be no denying that American education today is at a disadvantage when its social effectiveness is compared with that of education in the totalitarian states, but to say that the challenge cannot be coped with is to deny the validity of the assumptions of democracy. The solution of the problem of democratic education lies not in retreat, not in compromise, but in frank realization of the situation, and the will to attack without further delay. Here is one presentation of the situation that confronts education today:

While "democracy" may not be the only symbol around which a unified program of education may be built, there are sound reasons for using it today. Unfortunately, the opponents of democracy throughout the world appear to be much clearer concerning their objective—be it fascism or communism—than are most laymen and schoolmen who lean toward democracy. Consequently, the preservation and promotion of democracy in the United States depends in large measure upon what youth learns about the democratic way of life in the public schools. Unless the American people, young and old, come to understand more clearly the principles of shared interests, democracy will go down before the attack of less desirable, but more exactly defined, forms of social organization. Furthermore, democracy contains within itself the opportunity for continued readjustment as the area of
common interests widens. Democracy does not set a static goal; it presents a dynamic principle of continuous growth for the individual and the whole social group through the creation of new purposes and the continued increase in the common concerns that reach beyond all past attainments.61

It might be assumed by the less critically minded that education, in the fight to protect democracy, has as allies the Atlantic and the Pacific, but such, unfortunately, is not entirely the case. The threat of Naziism and Fascism and Communism is real enough, and were they the only threats education would have its hands full, but perhaps the most insidious and baleful menace is that which comes from within—the real "fifth column," composed of Americans, and Americans who are not Bund members! Newlon points out that:

The problems of educational leadership are complicated and difficult in such a milieu but by no means hopeless. The proponents of genuine democracy have resources at their disposal. The ideals and habits of democracy are deeply ingrained in the people. Americans have great faith in education. Of course, every cause and every interest makes their appeal to democratic ideals, and if fascism ever comes here, it will come in the garb of Americanism and democracy. The question is whether our history and traditions will be employed in the interests of the people or against them. The answer to that question will be determined to a considerable extent by the courage and quality of our educational leadership. There is no good and valid reason inherent in the situation within our own country that educational leadership should fail. But if it is to succeed, it must go to the people, all the people. For in the people is the only power that can subdue the power wielded by inertia and by the entrenched special interests in our society.62

Another writer is even more aroused at the peril which faces education in a democracy. He sees clearly the fate of education as we know it should the forces of anti-democracy, boring from within, gain control —complete control—in America.

62Newlon, op. cit., p. 138
If organized education cherishes freedom for itself, its first task is the marshalling of its resources for the purpose of preserving and perfecting a condition of society in which this great liberating tradition may live and flourish. Let the reign of authority return and the school will become a handmaiden of autocratic power, a defender of privilege, a conservator of fixed doctrine, an instrument for sealing the eyes, stopping the ears, stilling the tongue, and darkening the mind of each generation.\textsuperscript{63}

Two Views of Education

For a period of more than a generation two views of the process of education have bid for recognition, but today one stands practically unchallenged, at least in theory, while the other, though dominating the practice of education daily upon millions of young Americans, has been almost entirely discredited. The older view supported by the S-R bond school of psychologists maintained that education was a mechanistic process of habituation. On the other hand the other view, fathered by John Dewey, and the one held by the writer, has stressed that education is a creative process, emphasizing the active and experimental aspects of learning. Psychologically this view of education is championed by what we know as Gestalt psychology. The dictatorships of the Old World, in planning their systems of "education," have for the most part entirely disregarded the concepts of the newer view of the educative process. Their purpose could be better served by a system of education which was long on moulding and habituation, and short on creation and experimentation. Democracy cannot be achieved and furthered by the instrument of autocracy.

Educational Tools

The Progressive Education program

But when educators, intent on educating for democracy, cast aside

\textsuperscript{63}Counts, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 292.
the tool of despotism they do not performe pick up the tool of democracy. The choice of the best instrument for their use still remains. There is much material which can be used in the fashioning of that best tool. The Progressive Education Association has formulated a tentative philosophy for the thing they call "progressive education," though there is much doubt as to whether it is the answer for which educators are searching.

We look to education, in short, to make culture aware of itself in order that its essential values may be made more effective. Education is thus to be put in the service of the democratic culture not to be dominated by it, but to function as an agency conscious of its obligation to free the individual and the culture alike from the domination of hysterical leaders, authoritarian values, fragmentary ideals, and the inertia of ignorance.64

Setting up requirements for education, within the framework of the philosophy quoted above, the P. E. A. says:

The schools of a democracy are in duty bound . . . to do the following things:

1. They should acquaint their pupils with what is significant in man's progress from savagery to and including his present stage of civilization.

2. They should teach their pupils to think as clearly as they are able to do. Implicated in this is training against the influences of prejudice and propaganda, fears, and selfishness. It involves the study and free discussion of most questions, and the forming of opinions, though often only tentative ones.

3. They should make clear the difference between the ideals of democracy and the fundamentals of other ideologies.

4. They should give their pupils experience in carrying on group affairs, and should give them such contact with community affairs, and participation in them as proves possible and valuable.

5. They should avoid teaching the pupils what to think, even about democratic form of government.65


The attack from the "right."--Criticism has been directed against the Progressive Education program for the schools from both the left and the right. The traditionalists, who are in a large measure the defenders of the status quo in society as well as in the schools, have attacked the program on the grounds that it removes education from the realm of the immaculate, the essence of which is timelessness, contending that too much emphasis is placed on the dynamic, commonplace aspects of society. It seems to the writer that insofar as this criticism is justified, then to that extent is the value of the program as an instrument for educating for democracy assured.

The attack from the "left."--It has been mentioned that the program has also been attacked from what we may call the "left" as well. A powerful group of thinkers and educators see in the Progressive Education program, and particularly in its final dictum, that pupils should be taught how to think, but not what to think, the loophole through which education may shirk its responsibility to democracy. One of them points out that the theory, carried to a logical conclusion:

Compels the teacher to avoid the steps essential to enabling the learner to see and make as his own the only possible inferences in many critical situations involving the principles, values, needs, and instrumentalities of democracy. It means that in actual practice the schools of democracy would be freed from direct concern for the future of democracy.66

If the analysis followed by Newlon is valid it seems that he has made a strong case against the program of the Progressive Education Association. It is pointed further that the situation is not one simply of either/or. In this connection he states:

To hold that this procedure is the only alternative to teaching a blueprint of a new social order is unrealistic, for there is a vast difference between enabling youth to understand the necessity of an extension of democratic social control of the economy, or of planning, and teaching a blueprint for the new order. 67

An alternative program—Counts

The alternative intimated by Newlon in the above quotation cannot be summed up in a few words, but the categories of knowledge with which the school should deal as listed by Counts probably approximate at least the substance of that alternative. They are:

1. The school should give a broad account of the nature and history of man.
2. The school should tell the story of American democracy.
3. The school should trace with great care the rise of industrial society.
4. The school should give a bold and clear analysis of the present structure of American society.
5. The school should introduce its pupils to the more crucial contradictions and conflicts which grow out of the maladjustments in the culture and social structure and which shake contemporary society to its foundations.
6. The school should pass in honest and critical review the various social ideas, philosophies, and programs which are competing for survival and mastery in the world.
7. The school should acquaint the rising generation as thoroughly and completely as possible with the actual agencies and methods of propaganda.
8. The school should develop a challenging conception of the purposes and potentialities of democracy in the United States and the world today. 68

Newlon adds that:

All important points of view should be fairly considered. Nothing would be concealed. No critical problem would be evaded. But education should, nevertheless, be consciously planned to win American youth to loyalty to democracy thus interpreted. And loyalty to democracy thus interpreted means loyalty to the ideals of freedom of inquiry, freedom of thought, of speech, of publication. 69

67 Ibid. 68 Counts, op. cit., pp. 330-337.
Moulding the individual inevitable.--Newlon frankly admits that this conception recognizes that the moulding of the individual is unavoidable. But is moulding essential? Is this kind of moulding compatible with the assumptions on which democracy stands? Isn't the method outlined in reality the same method, with important modifications, of course, that the forces of anti-democracy themselves use? Most important, can true democracy, its principles, and loyalty to it, be "taught" by the moulding process? In the light of the assumptions of democracy, the program for democracy, and the definition of education, the answer is no.

Undemocratic aspects.--In his program for American democracy Counts stated, firstly, that the friends of democracy must have faith in political democracy. It appears then that he is one of those friends of democracy who has not the requisite faith. By upholding, in effect at least, the use of indoctrination both he and Newlon have made themselves vulnerable to attack on the grounds that they do not have faith in the efficacy of more democratic techniques. Are they not, also, by implication casting doubt on the validity of the program proposed for democracy by Counts? If the program is not inherently reasonable enough to gain support after thorough and democratic investigation in the school, then why the need for "moulding"? There is further room for criticism. Let us assume that it is possible at one time to obtain from all of the more than a million American teachers their acceptance of the proposition that this so-called "moulding" process is the way to teach a democratic program and democratic principles and loyalties. Further suppose that all of these teachers apply

---

70 Ibid., p. 217.
this method conscientiously and to the best of their abilities. What
would the results be? For a time, say for two or three years, apparently
effective results would probably be attained. But what would happen in
five years, ten years, fifteen years, to these teachers? It is too much
to hope that all, or even a very sizable minority of these million
teachers, would remain alert to the constant changes that occur in demo-
cratic society. Would they not, for the most part, be performing the
moulding process in the same manner and using the same materials as in
the beginning? Is it not true that the moulding procedure would result,
over a period of years, in placing education in almost the identical
position in which it finds itself today? That is, is not the charge
justified that modern education no longer prepares people for living in
this age? Democracy is ever evolving, ever changing, and in a democracy
a static institution is as dangerous, or even more dangerous, than an
institution in active opposition. Three hundred years ago Francis Bacon
saw the danger in simply standing still, and wrote:

As the births of living creatures at first are ill-shapen, so
are all Innovations, which are the births of time. Yet notwith-
standing, as those that first bring honour into their family are
commonly more worthy than most that succeed, so the first precedent
(if it be good) is seldom attained by imitation. For Ill, to man’s
nature as it stands perverted, hath a natural motion, strongest in
continuance; but Good, as a forced motion, strongest at first.
Surely every medicine is an innovation; and he that will not apply
new remedies must expect new evils; for time is the greatest innovator;
and if time of course alter things to the worse, and wisdom and coun-
sel shall not alter them to the better, what shall be the end? It is
true that what is settled by custom, though it be not good, yet at
least it is fit; and those things which have long been together, are
as it were confederate within themselves; whereas new things piece
not so well; but though they help by their utility, yet they trouble
by their inconformity. Besides, they are like strangers; more admired
and less favoured. All this is true, if time stood still; which con-
trariwise moveth so round, that a forward retention of custom is as
turbulent a thing as an innovation; and they that reverence too much old times are but a scorn to the new.71

It is too early to speak with assurance, but there is good reason to believe democracy, by definition dynamic, had become so static in France as to become practically non-existent and thus made the conquest of the country a comparatively simple matter. Education, neither in method, materials, nor in outlook can afford to become static if democracy is to be preserved.

A proposed approach—the democratic way

After all, if education espouses the cause of democracy, isn’t the first job to so arm the people that anti-democracy will be disarmed? It is legitimate to ask whether those forces of autocracy and despotism will be disarmed if the school makes use of the instrument of indoctrination. The answer is no. If education is to contribute to the preservation of the ideals and principles of democracy it would do far better to so equip the individuals with whom it has contact that they may not only solve the problems of the present, but also be able to solve the problems which will arise in the future. Educating people in such a way that they are equipped with the tools for attacking immediate problems is the only insurance democracy can have; the only insurance it needs against the onslaught of other enemies in the future. This is the only conclusion possible consistent with the second assumption of democracy, “confidence in a constant drive toward the perfectibility of mankind.”72

71Francis Bacon, "Of Innovations," Essays--Colours of Good and Evil--Advancement of Learning, p. 59. (Italics supplied for emphasis by writer of thesis.)

72Merriam, op. cit., p. 11.
Education need not risk the possibility of the "specious neutrality" of the Progressive Education Association program, nor elect the opposite extreme of applying indoctrination to fulfill its mission. There is another way: the way of the dynamic democracy. Every effort can and must be made to supply the pupils with every possible source of information concerning all the problems facing democracy, and this means more than a mere collection of books. It means making use of the community—local, state, national and international—to the end that real economic and social ills may be seen in all their hideousness. It means that the teacher must become, with the students, a searcher after facts. It does not, however, mean that after the pupils have reached conclusions the teacher must remain aloof, for such an attitude on the part of the teacher will surely lead to sabotaging the ultimate step—taking action in the light of the conclusions reached. And this most assuredly removes the loophole mentioned by Newlon through which the timid and vacillating teacher may shirk his responsibility. The whole process, too, must be carried on in such an atmosphere of true democracy in the relationships between teacher and pupil, pupil and pupil, pupil and administration, and teacher and administration that the blight of authoritarianism cannot be cast upon the school. Such a program can be followed only when there is complete and utter faith in the efficacy of the democratic process and in the essential dignity and worth of man.74

The Forward Look

The achievement of the program outlined will require that each

---

73 Newlon, op. cit., p. 217. 74 Merriam, op. cit., p. 11.
practice, principle and instrumentality of American education be systematically scrutinized by educators in the light reflected from the ever-shifting domestic and foreign setting, while being weighed in the balance to determine their compatibility with the assumptions of democracy and their utility as instruments for preserving and furthering American democracy. The object of the present study is to examine the instrumentality, homogeneous grouping, as it conditions education for dynamic democracy. The question posed is whether or not homogeneous grouping, as it operates in the situation described, is compatible with the principles laid down above. In the following chapter the investigatory program set up for the purpose of arriving at an answer to the question posed will be described.
CHAPTER III

THE INVESTIGATORY PROGRAM

Selection of Groups

As originally planned the tests and scales chosen were to have been given to two sections, the highest and lowest, in each of the low sixth, high seventh, and high eighth half grades. It was decided, however, that results from only the low sixth and the high eighth half grades would serve the purpose of the study, and would also permit the use of a larger number of children, since it would then be possible to take four sections from each of the two half-grades under consideration instead of only two. It was essential, in view of the plan of attack, that the two half grades chosen represent as great a difference in degree of familiarity with homogeneous grouping as possible, and for this reason the low sixth grade, whose members had just come to junior high school from the elementary schools, and who had, therefore, little acquaintance with grouping was selected to be compared with the high eighth grade, whose members had been grouped for almost three years. In each of the half grades used the tests and scales were administered to the two highest-ranked sections and to the two lowest-ranked sections.

Permission to administer the tests and scales as well as access to the school records was obtained, through the cooperation of the principal of the school, from the superintendent of schools, with the stipulation
that no school time, other than the activity period, would be used in
gathering the desired data. This limitation presented some difficulties
which remained insoluble, and necessitated the use of tests brief enough
to be completed by the children in less than twenty-five minutes.

Tests and Scales

The attitude scale.—No commercial attitude scale was found which
seemed to be adapted to use in the problem at hand, and for that reason
the writer constructed the scale which was used. At least two of the
types of attitude questions used by Gardner Murphy and Rensis Likert in
their studycl seemed especially adapted for use in the present study.
These investigators used several types of items, among them a partially
complete statement with multiple completing phrases type, and a type in
which there was a statement with five possible reactions: strongly
approve, approve, undecided, disapprove, and strongly disapprove. For
the examination into the attitudes of children it was deemed unwise to
attempt to present the possibility of so great a range in shading in
opinion, and therefore the questions used in the writer's scale listed
only three possible answers. In general the writer modeled his other
type of item, those appearing in Part One of the scale, much more closely
after those used by Murphy and Likert.2

The scale is composed of two divisions. Part One contains eleven
partially complete statements, followed by three or four phrases or clauses,

1Gardner Murphy and Rensis Likert, Public Opinion and the Individual,
pp. 16-22.

2See Appendix A, p. 39.
each of which will complete the statement. The children were asked to choose the phrase or clause which, when added to the partially complete statement, best expressed their own attitude toward the situation presented. Part Two of the scale is composed of questions, each of which could be answered "yes," or "no," or, in the case of a child who was undecided as to his answer, could be marked "undecided." The sixth grade children were asked to answer twenty-one of these questions, while the eighth grade children were asked to answer an additional twenty questions of the same type, but which covered material bearing more especially on their own interests and knowledges peculiar to them as eighth graders.

Due to the limitations placed upon the administration of the tests and scales no attempt was made to determine, by means of a pre-test, which questions were particularly significant and which were not, though as might be expected certain of the questions were answered quite uniformly by all of the children, and are therefore deemed to have little significance for this study.

**Socio-Economic Status Scale.**—For the determination of the socio-economic status of the examinees the widely-used Sims Score Card for Socio-Economic Status, Form C., was used. This device was readily administerable in the twenty-five minute period allowed for the testing, and yielded quantitative data adaptable to the statistical method applied in this study.

**Intelligence test.**—No intelligence test was chosen and administered by the writer for the purpose of gathering data of this type. The Otis Self-Administering Intelligence Test is given to all children in the Houston Public Schools at least once every two years. The intelligence
quotients recorded herein were taken from the school records. The tests were given to the low sixth grade children when they were members of the high fifth grade in elementary school, while the scores for the high eighth grade students were taken from tests these children took while they were members of the high seventh grade. Thus, in no case were the intelligence quotients recorded obtained more than one year prior to the date of administration of the other tests used. The lack of reliability of results obtained from any group intelligence test is doubtless present in the data presented herein; however, this material was considered adequate for the purposes of the present study.

Administration of Tests

Since sixteen separate days would have had to be arranged for if the writer alone had attempted to administer the tests to each of the sections, an arrangement was made whereby the three members of the school guidance committee assisted in the administration of the tests. As soon as was possible, during the fall semester of 1939, a schedule for giving the tests to the low sixth grade sections involved was set up; however, it was soon discovered that no rigid schedule could be adhered to due to the variations to which the activity period, at which time the tests were scheduled, was subject. Because of inclement weather on some of the days used for testing a certain amount of follow-up testing was necessary to get scores on children who had been absent on the day the test had been given originally.

Arrangements were made with the registrars of the various sections tested to supervise the home-rooms of the writer and of the members of
the guidance committee on days that the tests were administered. There is some basis for belief that the method of administration was not absolutely uniform among the four administrators; however, this factor could not be removed. Each administrator, insofar as was possible, administered both the tests to the same sections so that there would be less danger, at least in the case of the second test given, of unnecessary excitement which might attend the introduction of another strange teacher for the purpose of giving another test.

**Scoring the Tests**

For the scoring the Sims Score Card for Socio-Economic Status the key furnished was, of course, used. Since the attitude scale was constructed by the writer it was necessary that a scoring key also be made. This was done by purely arbitrary means. Each question in the entire scale was carefully considered, and the answer which seemed to the writer to express the position which would be taken by a child completely satisfied with the school situation was assigned a value of 10. In the case of the questions composing Part Two the answer "undecided" was accorded a value of 5, while the answer expressing the opinion directly opposite to that assigned the value 10 was assigned the value of 0. Since some of the phrases and clauses in Part One represent intermediate degrees of satisfaction or dissatisfaction they were assigned a value of 5, and those answers considered to represent the position which would be taken by a highly dissatisfied child were assigned a value of 0. The score for the entire scale was arrived at by simply adding the total of all points on all questions. Thus, the higher the total score the higher the degree
of satisfaction with the school situation is indicated, while the lower the score the lower the degree of satisfaction with the school situation. Since some questions were not adaptable to this type of scoring they were disregarded in the scoring entirely.

In the following chapter the data arrived at by means of the testing program herein described will be examined statistically in an effort to determine, at least tentatively, some implications for homogeneous grouping as practiced in Stonewall Jackson Junior High School. As has been mentioned, the character of the groups studied, and the fact that no heterogeneous control groups were measured, precludes the possibility of establishing statistically a valid cause-effect relationship between grouping and the peculiar statistical arrangement of the data in the present study.
CHAPTER IV

INTERPRETATION OF DATA

In the preceding chapter the technique used in securing the data herein presented was described. The data taken from the three sources heretofore mentioned will in this chapter be examined for the purpose of determining what trends and tendencies, if any, make themselves evident. In order to facilitate this study the data has been arranged in tabular form.

In Table 1 the median and mean intelligence quotients for the eight sections demonstrate clear stratification in every case, as would be expected since intelligence quotient formed one of the bases for grouping.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Median I. Q.</th>
<th>Mean I. Q.</th>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Median I. Q.</th>
<th>Mean I. Q.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L-6 A</td>
<td>122.0</td>
<td>122.4</td>
<td>H-8 A</td>
<td>118.5</td>
<td>118.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L-6 B</td>
<td>116.0</td>
<td>116.8</td>
<td>H-8 B</td>
<td>111.0</td>
<td>112.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L-6 Y</td>
<td>88.0</td>
<td>88.7</td>
<td>H-8 Y</td>
<td>98.0</td>
<td>96.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L-6 Z</td>
<td>77.5</td>
<td>77.4</td>
<td>H-8 Z</td>
<td>95.5</td>
<td>94.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1

MEDIAN AND MEAN INTELLIGENCE QUOTIENTS FOR EACH SECTION YIELDED BY THE OTIS SELF-ADMINISTERING INTELLIGENCE TEST

As has been mentioned in Chapter I, however, this basis for grouping was
of more importance in the formation of the low sixth grade groups than the high eighth grade groups since the average of academic achievement scores receives greater attention than the intelligence quotients for all re-groupings following the original grouping at the beginning of the low sixth year when the children enter junior high school from the elementary schools. The stratification of intelligence quotients in the high eighth grade shown in the table is more significant, therefore, than the same tendency in the low sixth grade sections. The fact that both measures of central tendency, the median and the mean, are practically identical indicates that distribution of scores in every section is rather even, as is shown, of course, by the raw data.\(^1\) The fact that the spread between the central tendencies of the two highest-ranked groups and the two lowest ranked groups is less in the case of the high eighth sections than in the case of the low-sixth sections seems to emphasize the fact that less attention is paid to intelligence quotients in the formation of sections for the high eighth grade.

In Table 2 the means and medians of scores made on the attitude scale show, in general, that the higher ranked sections in both the low sixth and high eighth grades are better satisfied with the school situation than are their lower-ranked fellow students, with two notable exceptions. In both half grades the lowest-ranked section, designated as "Z," seems to be, on the average, better satisfied than the next-to-lowest ranked section, "Y." In the case of the low-sixth grade, section "Z" is indicated as being even a little better satisfied with the situation

\(^1\)See Appendix B, pp. 98-101.
than section "B which is next-to-highest in rank. The fact that in the
sixth grade "Z" section there considerably fewer cases from which to
take the mean and median probably played no small part in this apparent
reversal of the trend. It is probably true that since these lowest-
ranked sections ordinarily have a small enrollment and therefore often

TABLE 2

THE SECTION, NUMBER OF CASES, MEANS, MEDIANs, AND PERCENTAGES
REPRESENTING DEGREE OF SATISFACTION WITH
THE SCHOOL SITUATION INDICATED
BY THE ATTITUDE SCALE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Number of Cases</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L-6 A</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>240.0</td>
<td>75.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L-6 B</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>225.1</td>
<td>70.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L-6 Y</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>217.9</td>
<td>68.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L-6 Z</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>227.0</td>
<td>70.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H-8 A</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>323.2</td>
<td>62.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H-8 B</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>300.7</td>
<td>57.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H-8 Y</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>269.8</td>
<td>51.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H-8 Z</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>284.8</td>
<td>54.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The mean percentage, representing degree of satisfaction, calculated from the mean of all scores in the half-grade.

receive an inordinate share of students new to the school, due to the
fact that sections in which they would ordinarily be placed are already
full, there is a tendency for the means and medians of the scores on
the attitude scale to be skewed to some extent. It would be expected,
probably, especially in the eighth grade, that children unfamiliar with
the school situation would register a higher degree of satisfaction, all
other factors being equal, than children thoroughly acquainted with the
school, and the attendant advantages and disadvantages of being a member of the lowest ranked homogeneous group in the grade.

To obtain the percentages shown in the table the mean score for the section was divided by the total possible score on the attitude scale. In the case of the sixth grade sections the highest possible score on the test was 320, representing the score which would be made, theoretically, by a child completely satisfied with the status quo insofar as it was presented by the questions in the scale. In the case of the high eighth grade sections the total possible score was 520, representing, as in the case of the sixth grade, complete satisfaction with the school situation. Perhaps the most striking thing about these percentages is the very obvious fact that the eighth grade children, as a group, are far more dissatisfied with the situation than are the sixth grade children. This can probably be accounted for, very largely, by the fact that the eighth graders have, in the main, had more than two and one half school years of acquaintance with the school situation, while the sixth graders have been in contact with the school less than one half year. Since no effort was made to establish the reliability of the attitude scale as a whole the validity of the foregoing statement is open to some question. In view of the limitations already placed on the scale, however, there still seems to be considerable significance to the fairly wide diversity between the degrees of satisfaction represented by the two mean percentages for the sixth and eighth grade groups as a whole.

The means and medians of the scores made by the various sections on the Sims Socio-Economic Status Score Card, presented in Table 3, show a very close relationship between them in every case. This seems to
## TABLE 3

**MEDIANs AND MEANS OF SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS**
**SCORES FOR EACH SECTION YIELDED**
**BY THE SIMS SCORE CARD**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L-6 A</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>H-8 A</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>23.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L-6 B</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>H-8 B</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>18.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L-6 Y</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>H-8 Y</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L-6 Z</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>H-8 Z</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

indicate that the distribution of scores throughout the range for each section to be rather even. Perhaps the most interesting peculiarity of the means and medians shown on the table is the indication that a process of selection seems to have been going on during the period between the low sixth grade and the high eighth grade insofar as socio-economic status of the children is concerned. It will be seen that both the mean and the median socio-economic status score for each of the four sections of the eighth grade is definitely higher than is the corresponding measure of central tendency for the corresponding sixth grade section. Assuming that the variance existing between the scores of corresponding high eighth and low sixth grade sections to be valid, the explanation seems to lie in the hypothesis that this particular school, if not all schools, has served as a selective institution, draining off at the bottom the children from the lower socio-economic levels during the three years children are in the school. Since the study does not cover a three year period, following the same group of children throughout
their career in junior high school, the foregoing statement cannot be 
established beyond question, due to the possibility of the entrance of 
a variety of extraneous factors. The steady decline in the mean and 
the median socio-economic status scores throughout the range of sections, 
from highest-ranked to lowest-ranked in each half-grade seems to be 
rather closely related to the decline in intelligence quotient scores, 
as noted in the discussion earlier in this chapter. That there is a 
tendency for children grouped homogeneously with respect to intelli-
gence quotient and average academic scores, to be grouped homogeneously 
with regard to socio-economic status as well seems to be indicated be-
yond reasonable doubt.

Table 4 presents the coefficients of correlation between intelli-
gence quotients and attitude scores, intelligence quotients and socio-
economic status scores, and socio-economic status scores and attitude 
scores. In order to increase if possible the reliability of the corre-
lations the two lowest-ranked sections and the two highest-ranked sections 
in each half-grade were grouped together, thus materially increasing the 
number of scores on which the correlations are based. Due to the fact 
that the coefficients of correlation are uniformly so low as to lack 
definite significance for the present study all will be discussed to-
gether. What little significance they do have probably lies in the fact 
that, with one exception, all are positive correlations, indicating that 
to a somewhat minute degree there is some positive relationship between 
the pairings studied; however, it is dangerous to place much faith in 
this rather tenuous significance. The study of tables 1, 2, and 3 leads 
the assumption that there is a close relationship between each of the
TABLE 4

THE COEFFICIENTS OF CORRELATION BETWEEN INTELLIGENCE QUOTIENTS AND ATTITUDE SCORES, INTELLIGENCE QUOTIENTS AND SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS SCORES, AND SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS SCORES AND ATTITUDE SCORES FOR EACH GROUPING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grouping</th>
<th>Intelligence Quotients and Attitude Scores</th>
<th>Intelligence Quotients and Socio-Economic Status</th>
<th>Socio-Economic Status Scores and Attitude Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L-6 (A-B)</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L-6 (Y-Z)</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H-8 (A-B)</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H-8 (Y-Z)</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

three factors on which data has been obtained, since it will be remembered that the means and medians of scores when tabulated demonstrated rather clear stratification between the various sections with respect to each of the three factors studied. It would seem, then, that there is a discrepancy somewhere, since the coefficients of correlation show clearly that practically no relationship exists. When it is considered, however, that coefficients of correlation are measures of relationships between the scores on an individual basis instead of on a group basis, as is the case of the medians and the means, the apparent discrepancy dissolves. It is quite possible for such group measures as the median and the mean to indicate a rather striking relationship between two variables, while an individual measure, such as the coefficient of correlation, may indicate a much less striking relationship, or even a negative relationship between the same two variables. This seems to be the case here. These
coefficients of correlation indicate rather decisively that homogeneous grouping seems almost entirely unrelated to those relationships in the individual cases between intelligence quotient and satisfaction or dissatisfaction with the school situation; between intelligence quotient and socio-economic status; and between socio-economic status and satisfaction or dissatisfaction with the school situation.

In summarization the following statements would seem to be justified:

1. In the homogeneous groups there is definite stratification, on a group basis, of intelligence quotients, though this tendency is more pronounced in the case of the low sixth grade sections than in the high eighth grade sections, due to the fact that in the sixth grade the process of grouping is based chiefly on intelligence quotients rather than on academic achievement which is the principal basis for grouping in the case of the eighth grade sections.

2. In both the high eighth and the low sixth half grades children in the higher-ranked homogeneous groups are better satisfied with the school situation than are their fellows in the lowest-ranked homogeneous groups.

3. Children in the high eighth grade sections, taken as a group, are distinctly more dissatisfied with the school situation than are the low sixth grade children, taken as a group.

4. A tendency seems to have been present in the school to select and retain children from the higher socio-economic levels, while those from the lower levels seem to have been dropped, to a certain extent, during the junior high school years.

5. There is a fairly marked tendency for homogeneous grouping of
children with regard to average academic achievement and intelligent quotient to produce homogeneity with regard to socio-economic status as well.

6. Homogeneous grouping is not closely associated, in individual cases, with relationships between intelligence quotient, attitudes toward the school, and socio-economic status.

In the final chapter the foregoing findings will be considered with respect to their implications for democracy.
CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Restating the problem of the present study, we have to determine the implications of certain aspects of homogeneous grouping for democracy. The findings listed at the close of Chapter IV constitute the aspects of homogeneous grouping under consideration, and will be viewed in the light of the limitations placed upon the study in Chapter I. In Chapter II an effort was made to survey, rather briefly, the great variety of factors which condition democracy and education in the modern world. The tentative conclusions reached in Chapter II regarding democracy and education, along with the assumptions of democracy, quoted in Chapter I, constitute the framework within which the aspects of homogeneous grouping will be considered. The implications will be incorporated in the conclusions drawn. The following conclusions, though tentative in character, seem to be in accordance with the data at hand:

1. The stratification of intelligence quotients which appeared in the findings represents an unwarranted lack of consideration for the essential dignity of man.¹ The implication exists that personality is cultivated on a differential rather than on a fraternal basis.² Hierarchies, always associated with despotisms, are incompatible with democracy, and therefore, since this stratification represents a type

²Ibid.
of hierarchy, there seems little reason to assume that this particular aspect of homogeneous grouping would serve a useful purpose in furthering democracy.

2. It has been observed that a continuation of the status quo is always fraught with danger for democracy. The fact being that there is a tendency for the higher ranked homogeneous groups to be more in sympathy with the status quo in the school situation than their lower-ranked fellows, it logically follows that democracy is endangered insofar as grouping does contribute to an attitude of passive acceptance of things as they are. It could not be construed that such an organization would tend to "widen continually the area of common interests shared by all the members of the group." In fact, the opposite trend would be given impetus if the evidence is accepted as being valid. The fact that it is the more capable children who are better satisfied with conditions, while the less-capable are the more dissatisfied, tends to increase the implied perils for the democratic way, rather than to decrease them.

3. The fact that the high eighth grade children, taken as a group, were found to be more dissatisfied than the low sixth grade children, taken as a group, cannot be credited, necessarily, to homogeneous grouping, for other factors may have had influence in this. However, regardless of the cause of the decrease in satisfaction with the school situation as the children progress through the junior high school, there is at least one very interesting implication for democracy. Democracy is probably pretty largely dependent upon this single factor for such changes

as do occur. It cannot be stated definitely that the tendency to get more dissatisfied with the status quo continues throughout the school life of the individual, but it seems to be a fairly safe assumption to make. It seems certain, however, that there comes a time in the life of the majority of individuals when they cease to grow more dissatisfied. Probably at about the age of thirty to forty the trend begins to reverse, so if we would preserve, for democracy’s sake, dissatisfaction with the status quo educators must utilize it during the years when it is most pronounced. Since the factor of increasing age probably has as much or more to do with the explanation for this dissatisfaction than homogeneous grouping, it is unreasonable to assume that such grouping is highly desirable for furthering the purpose. The need for further investigation in this field is indicated.

4. The lack of democracy obvious in the tendency on the part of the school to retain children from the higher socio-economic levels, while draining off from the bottom some from the lower socio-economic levels, need not be elaborated upon. Quotations from the writings of some of America’s Founding Fathers have indicated how insistent they were that all the people be educated. There would be less harm inherent to democracy if the school had a tendency to drop children from the higher socio-economic levels instead of the lower, for the chances are that the children of the wealthy will be educated, public school or no public school. Whether or not some of the blame for this tendency can be laid at the door of homogeneous grouping is open to question; however, if it is assumed that homogeneous grouping is at least partly responsible for the dissatisfaction of the lower-ranked groups with the school situation, then it is
reasonable to assume that it may be partly to blame, too, for the apparent selective character of the school.

5. The fact that there is a rather striking tendency for homogeneous grouping of children on the basis of intelligence quotient and average academic achievement to result in fairly homogeneous groups with respect to socio-economic status is freighted with implications for democracy. It would seem that a marked tendency in this direction could be assumed to offer a basis for the establishment of castes within the school, based partially on consciousness of greater worldly position and partly on consciousness of greater personal capability, insofar, at least, as academic achievement is a measure of general capability. It would seem that the tendency to segregate wealth from poverty has had a considerable share in the formation of the impasses with which democracy all over the world has been confronted during the past twenty years. There can be no satisfactory explanation, from the democratic point of view, for this particular aspect of homogeneous grouping. It cannot be condoned.

Recommendations

In the light of the foregoing conclusions it must be stated that there seems to be little evidence in favor of the retention of homogeneous grouping in the school situation. The statement, "No amount of gain in academic learning can offset damage to individuals and to our type of social order by fixing undesirable mental complexes or by stimulating recognition of social classes," places the stress on a different criteria.

for measuring homogeneous grouping than has been ordinarily applied. Consideration was not given in the present study to gains made in academic achievement, but if the quotation above can be accepted at its face value, sufficient evidence is at hand to obtain a conviction for homogeneous grouping. Therefore, it must be recommended that homogeneous grouping as it has been practiced in Stonewall Jackson Junior High School be eliminated. The evidence does not indicate the adaptability of homogeneous grouping for the purposes of education in a dynamic democracy.

There seem to be numerous fields open to further investigation. It appears that an investigation of the attitudes of the parents toward homogeneous grouping could serve a worthwhile purpose. The present study could be enlarged upon by the use of experimental and control groups and thus secure valid cause-effect relationships which would surely shed much valuable light on the problem at hand. Since it was unnecessary, for the purposes of the present study, to tabulate the answers to the various questions in the attitude scale, a fruitful field of research remains open in that direction. The influence of homogeneous grouping upon personality development seems to have interesting possibilities, and probably would be complementary with the present study.
APPENDIX A

PART I
ATTITUDE SCALE CONSTRUCTED BY THE WRITER AND GIVEN
TO EIGHT SECTIONS OF STONEWALL JACKSON
JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS

PART II
SIMS SCORE CARD FOR SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS
EXPLANATION AND INSTRUCTIONS

This is not a test. It has nothing to do with your school work, and it does not count on any of your grades. You are not to write your name on this paper because we do not want to know your name. Each paper is numbered for the purpose of keeping track of each. Some of the questions on these sheets are rather personal, but to be of any value each question must be answered exactly as you honestly feel. Do not try to answer these questions as you think your teacher would want you to answer them, nor as you think your parents would want you to answer them. We are interested in the way you think about things; not the way someone else thinks. There is no "right way" and no "wrong way" to answer these questions. One answer is just as good as another, so long as it expresses the way you think about the particular question.

PART ONE

Following are eleven partly completed statements. After each you will find three or four phrases, any one of which will complete the partly complete statement. One of these phrases probably expresses the way you feel about the matter. Find the one which most nearly expresses your opinion and draw a little circle with your pencil around the letter a, b, c, or d, which you find to the left of each phrase. There is no correct and no incorrect way to answer these statements, so you do not have to worry whether your answer is right or wrong. Read each statement carefully and then choose the phrase which expresses your own feelings.

Since coming to Jackson from elementary school I am:

a. More confident of my ability to succeed.
b. Just about as confident now as I was then.
c. Less confident now than before coming to Jackson.

I believe that the reason that there are more girls than boys in the higher sections is that:

a. Girls are just naturally smarter than boys.
b. Girls are more likely to get along with the teachers than are boys.
c. Boys are just as smart as girls, but don't think that studying hard enough to get high grades is worth the time it takes.
d. Teachers won't give most boys as high grades as they give to girls.

Since coming to Jackson from elementary school my parents seem:

a. More interested in my grades.
b. Just about as interested as they used to be.
c. Less interested than they used to be.
Since coming to Jackson from elementary school I am:

a. Happier than I used to be.
b. Just about as happy now as I was then.
c. Not so happy as I was before coming here.

I think that the reason that most of the football players are from the lower sections is that:

a. Football players don't have to be very smart.
b. The coaches don't like boys from the higher sections.
c. Boys from the higher sections spend too much time studying.
d. Boys from the higher sections are too sissy.

Since coming to Jackson from elementary school I think that I:

a. Enjoy my school work more than I used to.
b. Enjoy it about as much as I used to.
c. Enjoy it less than before.

If two boys break the same regulation of the school the one from the low section is:

a. More likely to get a whipping than the other boy who is in a high section.
b. Just as likely to get a whipping as the other boy.
c. Less likely to get a whipping than the other boy.

Since coming to Jackson from elementary school I am making:

a. Better grades than I used to make.
b. Just about the same kind of grades.
c. Poorer grades than I used to make.

I believe that in most cases the teachers assign parts in auditorium programs to:

a. Children who are especially talented.
b. Children who need the training that auditorium programs give.
c. Children who are most able to buy the right kind of costume.

Since coming to Jackson from elementary school I have:

a. Mostly the same friends that I used to have.
b. An entirely new set of friends.
c. Some of my old friends and many new ones, as well.
I think that the purpose of most of our auditorium programs is:

a. To give teachers a chance to show off their best pupils.
b. To entertain everyone in school.
c. To give children who need the training a chance to take part.
d. To give parents a chance to see how their children perform on the stage.

PART TWO

Under each of the following questions you will find three words, "yes," "undecided," and "no." Draw a circle around the word which seems to you to answer the question best as far as you are concerned. None of the answers are "right" and none are "wrong," as answers might be in English or Social Studies, and it makes no difference to anyone whether you answer it one way or the other, however, you are to answer each question exactly as you think it should be answered and not as someone else might want it answered. Try to make up your mind on each question so that your answer will be either yes or no. Try to mark as few questions "undecided" as you honestly can.

Do you think it is right for the school to charge small fees for certain courses such as typing, shop, and foods?

yes  undecided  no

Is it your opinion that teachers in general give assignments too long to classes from the higher sections?

yes  undecided  no

Do you believe that in most cases children whose parents have a good deal of money are likely to make better grades than are children whose parents are rather poor?

yes  undecided  no

Would it be better for everyone concerned, in your opinion, if all the children from the same section were required to sit together in the cafeteria?

yes  undecided  no

Do you think that it is generally more difficult for a girl from one of the lower sections to become a yell leader or a member of the pep squad than it is for a girl from one of the higher sections?

yes  undecided  no
Do you think that any girl, regardless of her grades and marks in conduct, should be eligible for nomination for football sponsor?

yes    undecided    no

Do you think that all children, no matter from what section they may come, have an equal chance to become members of the band and orchestra?

yes    undecided    no

Is it your belief that all of the teachers in Jackson treat all children with equal fairness, no matter from what section they come?

yes    undecided    no

Do you think that some of the teachers at Jackson are stricter in keeping order when teaching a low section than when teaching a high section?

yes    undecided    no

Should the most interesting B&F's be open only to those students who have made the highest grades in other subjects?

yes    undecided    no

Do you think that generally children from the higher sections have a better chance to take part in auditorium programs than do children from lower sections?

yes    undecided    no

Do you think that most of the teachers in Jackson would be more likely to give a higher grade to a pupil from a high section than to one from a lower section, even if they had done equally good work?

yes    undecided    no

Do you think that all Jackson students should be allowed to vote in school elections for football sponsor and king and queen, even though they had not purchased an athletic ticket or poll tax receipt?

yes    undecided    no

Have you found that there are some teachers who try to keep children from the lower sections out of their activity?

yes    undecided    no
Do you think that only those children who make high grades in junior high school should be allowed to go on to senior high?

yes  undecided  no

Do you think some system should be worked out whereby the handling of free lunch tickets in the cafeteria would be less embarrassing to those children who have to have free lunches?

yes  undecided  no

Do you think that only boys and girls with the highest grades should be permitted to help in the office during activity period?

yes  undecided  no

Do you think that, in general, boys from the higher sections are likely to be sissier than boys from one of the lower sections?

yes  undecided  no

Do you think that it is easier for a student to go down a section than it is to go up a section?

yes  undecided  no

Do you think that it is easier for a student to go up a section than it is to go down a section?

yes  undecided  no

Do you believe that only those children whose parents have plenty of money should be allowed to go to college?

yes  undecided  no

8th Grade

Do you think it right that people with a large amount of money should have to pay taxes at a higher rate than people with small incomes?

yes  undecided  no

Do you believe that the method by which American Legion Award winners are selected is fair to children of all sections?

yes  undecided  no.
Do you think that the public schools of Houston prepare students who are not going to college for their life as thoroughly as they prepare college students for college?

yes  undecided  no

If you parents and the school authorities were willing would you quit school now to take a $60.00 per month job if one were offered you?

yes  undecided  no

Do you believe that the membership of the P. T. A. is composed largely of the mothers of children in the higher sections of each grade?

yes  undecided  no

Do you believe it is fair to all concerned that there be strict regulations concerning the grades and conduct of all candidates for King and Queen in the spring elections?

yes  undecided  no

Do you think that candidates for offices of the eighth grade from the lower sections have as good a chance to get elected as candidates from the higher sections?

yes  undecided  no

Do you believe that some of the teachers in Jackson show preference for students taking the college course over students taking the non-college course?

yes  undecided  no

Do you think that certain minimum passing grades should be required for eligibility to play football, basketball, and softball?

yes  undecided  no

Do you think that Jackson would be a better school if all sections took the same courses in the eighth grade instead of having the college and non-college courses?

yes  undecided  no

Do you think that it would be better for all students concerned if the sections were not divided on the basis of grades made the previous semester?

yes  undecided  no
Have you found that the dividing of grades into sections tends to separate you from friends you may have had before changes in sections were made?

yes   undecided   no

Do you believe that shop, foods, clothing, and typing courses are of more value to students taking the non-college course than to those taking the college course?

yes   undecided   no

Do you believe that the reason non-college students are required to take general science and general math, is that these subjects are easier than Latin and algebra?

yes   undecided   no

Do you believe that in general only those children from the three or four upper sections should be permitted to take the so-called college course?

yes   undecided   no

Do you believe that the taking of the so-called non-college course indicates that a student does not have the ability necessary to do college work?

yes   undecided   no

Do you feel that certain organizations in the school, such as the Hi-Y, are more or less undemocratic?

yes   undecided   no

Do you think that the faculty of the school expects too much of the higher sections in the way of raising money for such things as the Community Chest, Athletic Tickets, etc.?

yes   undecided   no

Do you feel that, in general, teachers expect children in the higher sections to be better prepared than they have a right to expect?

yes   undecided   no

Do you think that young people without a job should get married and expect their parents to support them until times get better?

yes   undecided   no
Do you feel that too much work outside of the regular classrooms is required of students in the higher sections?

yes  undecided  no
SIMS SCORE CARD FOR SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS
Form C

Score..............................

1. Name......................................................

2. Age........................................Years and...............Months

3. Grade................................. Date...........................

4. Have you spent two years in any grade?........If so, what grades?......

5. Have you skipped any grades?......................If so, what grades?......

6. Home address: City..............................State...........................

7. How many years have you lived in this town?....................

8. Have you attended schools in any other towns?........If so, name them....................

9. Name of your School...........................

Don't answer any of the questions below until you are told what to do.
If you have brothers or sisters in this school, write their names and grades on these lines:

Name...........................................Grade......................

Name...........................................Grade......................

In the Following Questions Underline the Correct Answer:

Are you a Boy?  a Girl?  (Underline correct answer)

Are you living at home with your parents?..................Yes  No

Are you living in the home of someone else, such as a relative, adopted parent, guardian, etc.?........Yes  No

Are you living in an institution, such as an orphan asylum or a home for children?........Yes  No
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APPENDIX B

INTELLIGENCE QUOTIENTS, ATTITUDE SCORES, AND SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS SCORES FOR EIGHT SECTIONS OF STONEWALL JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>71</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### APPENDIX E—Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pupil No.</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Pupil No.</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>102a</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102b</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>102c</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## APPENDIX B—Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>133</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>134</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>395</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>144</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>145</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>146</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>147</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>148</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>149</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>151</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>152</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>153</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>154</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>155</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>156</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>157</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>158</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>159</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>160</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>161</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>162</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>163</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>164</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>165</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>166</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>198</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>199</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>202</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>204</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>205</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>206</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>207</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>208</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>209</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>210</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>211</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>212</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>213</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>214</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>215</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>216</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>217</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>218</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>219</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>220</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>221</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>222</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>223</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>224</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>225</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>226</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>227</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>228</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>229</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>230</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>231</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>231a</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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